

Johnson, who inserted the following statement into the Record just before the bill passed:

"This bill establishes uniform and clear standards, including both banking and competitive factors, for the consideration of proposed bank mergers. It eliminates a number of gaps in the statutory framework, which now permit many bank mergers to occur with no review by any Federal agency. It provides for a thorough review by the appropriate Federal bank supervisory agency, under these comprehensive standards, and with the benefit of any information which may be supplied by the Department of Justice in the report required from them, of the bank mergers by asset acquisition and other means which are now and will continue to be exempt from the antitrust provisions of section 7 of the Clayton Antitrust Act."

The majority leader added: "The repeated improvements [in this bill] . . . show the real merits, the real benefits of the legislative process at its best."

The intent of Congress in passing the Bank Merger Act was very clear. Yet, in June of 1960, following 2 years of litigation, the Supreme Court in ruling on a merger of two banks in Philadelphia which had been approved by the Comptroller of the Currency, said the merger violated section 7 of the Clayton Act.

Justice Warren, who disagreed with the majority, said, "I suspect that no one will be more surprised than the Government to find that the Clayton Act carried the day for its case in court. The result is, of course, that the Bank Merger Act is almost completely nullified; its enactment turns out to have been an enormous waste of congressional time and energy. This frustration of a manifest congressional design is, in my view, a most unwarranted intrusion upon the legislative domain."

Subsequently, the Supreme Court ruled that two banks in Lexington, Ky., which had merged in accordance with the provisions of the Bank Merger Act were in violation of the Sherman Act. Then in March 1963, a Federal district court in New York ruled that the Manufacturers Trust Co. and the Bankers Bank violated both the Clayton Act and the Sherman Act when they merged in 1961, after they had received the approval of the Federal Reserve Board.

On the basis of these rulings the Department of Justice could now challenge all of the more than 3,000 bank mergers which have been consummated since the Clayton Act was amended in 1960.

THE PURPOSE OF S. 1698

Obviously, there is a clear need for the legislation that is now before this committee. The ground rules governing bank mergers must be reaffirmed and the dark clouds of confusion must be removed from the numerous bank mergers that have been consummated in good faith under the law of the land.

S. 1698 would serve both of these purposes. It would place bank mergers virtually in the same category as mergers in other highly regulated industries.

There is no question that the banking industry is one of the most tightly regulated industries in the Nation. Before a bank is even chartered, the banking agencies must be assured that such a bank, if chartered, would meet the needs and convenience of the community. The agencies must also determine that the bank, if chartered, will have a reasonable chance of succeeding. A bank is not comparable to other businesses and it is viewed differently by the public at large. When a bank fails, repercussions are felt throughout the community. Last year, there were 18,501 business failures. This figure is about average. Yet when eight banks with total deposits amounting to eight one-thousandths of 1 percent of all bank deposits

failed in 1964, it made headlines and led to a congressional investigation, with which, incidentally, we have indicated our full cooperation. In short, a single bank failure is cause for concern because of the human and economic problems it creates for the community. That is why entry into the banking business is controlled.

Once a charter is granted to a bank, the bank becomes subject to very strict regulations which prescribe the amount a bank may lend to an individual or a corporation, how much it can pay in interest to attract deposits, how much it must maintain in cash reserves, and a host of other limitations. In fact, regulations pervade the whole spectrum of bank operations. Through periodic examinations, bank supervisory agencies make sure that the regulations are observed.

By using these bank-regulation and examination—bank supervisory authorities can control competition in banking on a continuing basis to make sure the system is sound and the public interest is protected.

Mr. Chairman, the American Bankers Association contends that the intimate working knowledge of banking gained by the supervisors in their daily association with banks is essential in regulating competition in banking. It is also our contention that this know-how is basic in considering the merits of bank mergers. Therefore, we are in full support of S. 1698 which would place bank mergers under the jurisdiction of the three Federal bank supervisory agencies.

The Justice Department would still play an advisory role in that the banking agency having jurisdiction would have to request a report on the competitive aspects of any merger under consideration. The banking agency would also have to request reports on competitive factors from the other two banking agencies.

But the first provision of S. 1698 would give the Federal bank supervisory agencies the final authority over bank mergers, which was what Congress intended when it passed the Bank Merger Act in 1960. It would exempt bank mergers from the provisions of the Sherman Act and section 7 of the Clayton Act.

THE QUESTION OF UNMERCED BANKS

The second provision of S. 1698 is designed to prevent the courts from breaking up mergers that were consummated under appropriate regulatory authority. Five mergers are now in the courts. Over 1,000 others could be challenged by the Department of Justice under the Supreme Court's interpretation of the antitrust laws.

"Unmerging" a bank after the two banks have operated as a single unit is nightmarish even in the abstract. The relationship between a depositor or borrower and his bank is based on mutual confidence and trust. In many cases, corporations and individuals select a particular bank because the bank offers the exact combination of services needed. This is particularly true when trust services are involved.

If a bank were to unmerge, internal working efficiency would be shattered. The customer, who has not been given much consideration in this whole question, would then be faced with the decision of which one of the two "unmerged" banks he would patronize. If the relationship is broken, the customer may decide that he does not want to get his business mixed up in the unmerging process and select neither of the two unmerged banks but a different bank, and in all probability, a larger one.

If this pattern of shifting to a larger bank in lieu of the unmerged banks prevailed, what effect would this have on competition? Instead of increasing competition, it is likely that unmerging of banks would lead to an increase in concentration in banking. This cannot be in the public interest.

Few observers believe the Justice Department would attempt to break up the 3,000-

odd bank mergers that have taken place since 1960. It would certainly create chaos in the financial system. But here again the question is one of equity and fair play. Should the Justice Department question some mergers and not others when they were approved by the same Federal authorities under the same law? After all we hear loud and long about being a government of laws and not of men.

The American Bankers Association strongly urges that all bank mergers which have been consummated, after receiving the approval of appropriate regulatory authorities, including those now being challenged in courts, be permitted to stand.

CONCLUSION

The executive council of the American Bankers Association, the ruling body of the association with members representing all divisions, sections, and committees of the ABA and all States in the Union, unanimously supports S. 1698. I request permission to insert the resolution in the record of these hearings. Many State bankers associations have taken similar action and indications are that others will do the same. Mr. Chairman, these actions by the ABA, which represents 98 percent of the Nation's commercial banks, plus the support coming from State bankers associations, demonstrate without doubt that the banking industry favors this legislation.

In our judgment, the present state of confusion in the field of bank mergers must be eliminated so that bankers can get back to their main task—meeting fully and efficiently the financial needs of the American economy. S. 1698 can clarify the whole situation and I urge its prompt passage. Thank you very much.

FE ~~OK~~ MCGEE

SUPPORT OF PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S POLICIES ON SOUTHEAST ASIA

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, it is encouraging to see large segments of the American press underscore the wide acceptance and approval of our President's policies in southeast Asia. It is encouraging to see many newspapers spread the message which is so essential; namely, that the United States of America seeks peace, and is anxious to help the people of South Vietnam and all other peoples of southeast Asia, to raise their heads and their standard of living.

Last Thursday, America's policies were again effectively enunciated by President Johnson, who, in speaking to a national television audience, gave the message that we will meet force with force, as we must, in order to restore peace and order, though we remain ever willing to take part in unconditional talks aimed at settlement of the war in southeast Asia.

I ask unanimous consent that editorials commenting on President Johnson's speech, from the Cincinnati Enquirer, the Washington Evening Star, and the Washington Daily News, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Cincinnati Enquirer, May 14, 1965]

L.B.J. Goes to the Front

President Johnson, in his televised speech on Thursday, was dueling with left-leaning intellectuals for support by the people of his policies in Vietnam.

Mr. Johnson, harkening back to the days of Theodore Roosevelt's big stick and soft

May 20, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

10665

talk, in attempting to prove to Communist aggressors that the United States will meet force with force, that armed conquest is futile and that aggression is not only wrong but will not work.

Opponents of the President's policy are attempting to arouse public opposition to Mr. Johnson's Vietnam policy by marching, picketing and demonstrating.

The *Enquirer*, on Thursday morning, published on page 1 a picture of an example of this. It was a photograph of some of the hundreds who marched through Washington Wednesday, picketed the Pentagon and conferred with Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara. The group pleaded for negotiation, not bombs, to settle the war in Vietnam.

Another example, also a picture, was published in the *Enquirer* on Tuesday. This was the placard-picketing on Monday of the estate of Dr. Joseph L. B. in Mount Washington when Vice President Humphrey and some 300 Democratic leaders were gathered there.

President Johnson in his Thursday speech, repeated his call for unconditional discussions in quest of a settlement of the war but emphasized also that Red China, which is the agitator behind North Vietnam, is not interested in a fulfillment of a desire by the Vietnamese for nationalism but in gaining control of all of Asia.

The President renewed his pledge to search for every possible path to peace and expressed again his interest in relieving the human needs and improving the lot of the Vietnamese people in their struggle for survival.

There is reason to fear, however, well meaning some of those who march against Mr. Johnson may be, that there may be false undercurrent of encouragement for their efforts because those efforts serve our calculating foes rather than the United States.

Returning again to "Teddy" Roosevelt, let us quote:

"Far better it is to dare mighty things, to win glorious triumphs, even though checkered by failure, than to take rank with those poor spirits who neither enjoy much nor suffer much, because they live in the gray twilight that knows not victory nor defeat." Negotiation, unless it is backed by power, strength, and resolve, is only a show of weakness to a powerful and predatory enemy power. In that context it is in the "gray twilight," to use the first President Roosevelt's words.

President Johnson, we conclude anew from his Thursday remarks, is trying to be a strong President who directs the course of events, rather than allowing them to direct him, in the interests of the safety of the people of this Nation. We believe he is right and we recommend that the people give to him their backing rather than give it to those who would have us lead from weakness rather than strength.

[From the Washington Evening Star, May 14, 1965]

AN EFFECTIVE APPEAL

There are those who think, and perhaps rightly so, that the President is making too many speeches in his attempt to explain, defend, and justify his policies in Vietnam. To some, the personality image which emerges from the television screen is not appealing. In our opinion, however, his televised address to the editorial cartoonists, in terms of content, was effective.

Mr. Johnson began by saying again, without any qualification, that we will not abandon our commitment to South Vietnam. It is desirable to plant this firmly in the minds of the enemy. He also restated his readiness to enter into unconditional discussions for a

settlement of the war. This, too, needs to be stamped indelibly upon the consciousness of friend and foe alike.

Most impressive, however, was the President's enumeration of the material improvements which have been made since 1954 in South Vietnam under what he correctly described as "circumstances of staggering adversity."

Mr. Johnson spelled them out in this fashion: In South Vietnam, always the rice bowl of Asia, rice production has been doubled. A new variety of sweetpotato has been introduced, promising a sixfold yield. Corn output should rise from 35,000 tons in 1952 to 100,000 tons by 1965. Pig production has more than doubled since 1955.

In South Vietnam, where life expectancy is 35 years, there are 300 doctors for 16 million people. In the United States there are 5,000 doctors for an equivalent number. So we are helping to build a medical school which will graduate 200 South Vietnamese doctors each year. More than 12,000 hamlet health stations have been built and stocked. More than 7 million people have been vaccinated against cholera and millions more against other diseases. There has also been much progress in the area of public education. To cite but one illustration, elementary school enrollment has risen from 300,000 in 1945 to more than 1,500,000 today. And, on the business front, a country which was virtually without industry 12 years ago now has more than 700 new or rehabilitated factories. And all of this work has gone on and will go on despite the costly, cruel war and the terrorist tactics of the Vietcong.

This may not be especially impressive in rich, overfed America. But as the message goes through, its import will not be lost upon millions of Asians who are reared in ignorance, racked by disease and whose lives are spent on the razor's edge of starvation. To them, the reference to corn and pigs will not be a joking matter.

The President concluded by saying that when peace finally comes we are ready to share this effort and this progress "with all the people of Vietnam—North and South alike." This was an appropriate note to strike. One must hope it is a note that will be heard in Hanoi.

[From the Washington Daily News, May 14, 1965]

L.B.J. MAKES HIS CASE ELOQUENTLY

President Johnson never has done a more persuasive job on an issue than he did Thursday in his TV appearance to detail again the ways and hows of United States policy in Vietnam.

Some seem to think the President is making these repeated enunciations of our purpose in Vietnam because a few vociferous professors and others keep ragging him on the subject. L.B.J. isn't going to reverse this particular brand of nonthinking—but addresses such as Thursday's can do a lot to solidify national understanding.

Moreover, this puts it up to the Communists once more. They show no more sign of relenting than the college hecklers. But there are other people in the world who do have open minds.

Our policy, the way Mr. Johnson stated it Thursday, is positive, not merely defensive.

Our preferred priority is on helping the South Vietnamese (and others in southeast Asia) to improve their lot. Since 1954, for instance, rice production has been doubled, new crops introduced, industrial production developed. This all would be much more meaningful, and farther along, except for the Communists who murder and pillage and force the Vietnamese and the United States to concentrate on military defense.

Americans would much rather devote

some of their resources to helping others with their economy and their standard of living. Our heavy expenditures on weapons are not by choice, but through necessity.

All the same, the President is still willing to sit down and talk it out.

The North Vietnamese obviously are hard to convince. Probably because for so many of the years this war has been going on they have been getting off easy, giving them the idea the United States was merely a "paper tiger" and that eventually they could overwhelm the South Vietnamese.

The President's purpose is to disabuse them of both notions—meanwhile being ready to negotiate and even readier to get on with peaceful ways to better life in southeast Asia, a program which would be far more useful to us and to the Asians than fighting.

There is nothing new or strange in this double-edged policy. This is what we did during and after World War II. We went all out to win and when the military job was finished we turned an enormous share of our effort and resources toward peaceful development around the world.

PROPOSED CUT IN SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE APPROPRIATIONS UNWISE

Mr. MOGEE. Mr. President, in the April issue of *American Forests* magazine there is an editorial which I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate. The editorial, entitled "Budget's 'Bombshell,'" is in opposition to the \$30 million proposed cut in the appropriations for the Soil Conservation Service.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the *Record*.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the *Record*, as follows:

BUREAU'S "BOMBHELL"

The Bureau of the Budget has not shown good judgment in cutting the technical assistance program of the Soil Conservation Service by \$30 million. Hearings should be called to give the conservation public an opportunity to be heard on a proposal that would impede the forward advance of an old line and fundamental conservation program if allowed to stand. The proposal should be defeated and, in the light of recent developments, more technical assistance provided for. At a time when new conservation proposals are being heard regarding beautification of America great care must be taken to see to it that basic programs are not damaged in the process.

There are reasons galore why this cut is unwise at this particular time. With new dust storms billowing up in the West this is obviously no time to cut back on the never-ending task of anchoring soil in place. As this magazine has pointed out on more than one occasion many western acres are in a deplorable condition and need help. While recent efforts by a variety of hard-hitting agencies are hopeful signs, this task of land stabilization has to be an across-the-board effort and the Soil Conservation Service program is a basic part of that effort.

A consistent conservation posture on the part of the administration is most important. When an impartial study group recently informed the administration that Negro farmers are getting the short end of the stick on agricultural aid efforts and that something should be done about it, the administration immediately concurred. Something certainly should be done, but a proposal to lop off \$30 million from the technical aid program would not appear to be con-

May 20, 1965

Johnson, who inserted the following statement into the Record just before the bill passed:

"This bill establishes uniform and clear standards, including both banking and competitive factors, for the consideration of proposed bank mergers. It eliminates a number of gaps in the statutory framework, which now permit many bank mergers to occur with no review by any Federal agency. It provides for a thorough review by the appropriate Federal bank supervisory agency, under these comprehensive standards, and with the benefit of any information which may be supplied by the Department of Justice in the report required from them, of the bank mergers by asset acquisition and other means which are now and will continue to be exempt from the antimerger provisions of section 7 of the Clayton Antitrust Act."

The majority leader added: "The repeated improvements [in this bill] . . . show the real merits, the real benefits of the legislative process at its best."

The intent of Congress in passing the Bank Merger Act was very clear. Yet, in June of 1968, following 2 years of litigation, the Supreme Court in ruling on a merger of two banks in Philadelphia which had been approved by the Comptroller of the Currency, said the merger violated section 7 of the Clayton Act.

Justice Harlan, who disagreed with the majority, said, "I suspect that no one will be more surprised than the Government to find that the Clayton Act carried the day for its case in court. The result is, of course, that the Bank Merger Act is almost completely nullified; its enactment turns out to have been an exorbitant waste of congressional time and energy. This frustration of a manifest congressional design is, in my view, a most unwarranted intrusion upon the legislative domain."

Subsequently, the Supreme Court ruled that two banks in Lexington, Ky., which had merged in accordance with the provisions of the Bank Merger Act were in violation of the Sherman Act. Then in March 1968, a Federal district court in New York ruled that the Manufacturers Trust Co. and the Hanover Bank violated both the Clayton Act and the Sherman Act when they merged in 1961, after they had received the approval of the Federal Reserve Board.

On the basis of these rulings the Department of Justice could now challenge all of the more than 2,000 bank mergers which have been consummated since the Clayton Act was amended in 1950.

THE PURPOSE OF S. 1696

Obviously, there is a clear need for the legislation that is now before this committee. The ground rules governing bank mergers must be reaffirmed and the dark clouds of confusion must be removed from the numerous bank mergers that have been consummated in good faith under the law of the land.

S. 1696 would serve both of these purposes. It would place bank mergers virtually in the same category as mergers in other highly regulated industries.

There is no question that the banking industry is one of the most tightly regulated industries in the Nation. Before a bank is even chartered, the banking agencies must be assured that such a bank, if chartered, would meet the needs and convenience of the community. The agencies must also determine that the bank, if chartered, will have a reasonable chance of succeeding. A bank is not comparable to other businesses and it is viewed differently by the public at large. When a bank fails, repercussions are felt throughout the community. Last year, there were 18,501 business failures. This figure is about average. Yet when eight banks with total deposits amounting to eight one-thousandths of 1 percent of all bank deposits

failed in 1964, it made headlines and led to a congressional investigation, with which, incidentally, we have indicated our full cooperation. In short, a single bank failure is cause for concern because of the human and economic problems it creates for the community. That is why entry into the banking business is controlled.

Once a charter is granted to a bank, the bank becomes subject to very strict regulations which prescribe the amount a bank may lend to an individual or a corporation, how much it can pay in interest to attract deposits, how much it must maintain in cash reserves, and a host of other limitations. In fact, regulations pervade the whole spectrum of bank operations. Through periodic examinations, bank supervisory agencies make sure that the regulations are observed.

By using these tools—regulation and examination—bank supervisory authorities can control competition in banking on a continuing basis to make sure the system is sound and the public interest is protected.

Mr. Chairman, the American Bankers Association contends that the intimate working knowledge of banking gained by the supervisors in their daily association with banks is essential in regulating competition in banking. It is also our contention that this know-how is basic in considering the merits of bank mergers. Therefore, we are in full support of S. 1696 which would place bank mergers under the jurisdiction of the three Federal bank supervisory agencies.

The Justice Department would still play an advisory role in that the banking agency having jurisdiction would have to request a report on the competitive aspects of any merger under consideration. The banking agency would also have to request reports on competitive factors from the other two banking agencies.

But the first provision of S. 1696 would give the Federal bank supervisory agencies the final authority over bank mergers, which was what Congress intended when it passed the Bank Merger Act in 1960. It would exempt bank mergers from the provisions of the Sherman Act and section 7 of the Clayton Act.

THE QUESTION OF UNMERGED BANKS

The second provision of S. 1696 is designed to prevent the courts from breaking up mergers that were consummated under appropriate regulatory authority. Five mergers are now in the courts. Over 2,000 others could be challenged by the Department of Justice under the Supreme Court's interpretation of the antitrust laws.

"Unmerging" a bank after the two banks have operated as a single unit is nightmarish even in the abstract. The relationship between a depositor or borrower and his bank is based on mutual confidence and trust. In many cases, corporations and individuals select a particular bank because the bank offers the exact combination of services needed. This is particularly true when trust services are involved.

If a bank were to unmerge, internal working efficiency would be shattered. The customer, who has not been given much consideration in this whole question, would then be faced with the decision of which one of the two "unmerged" banks he would patronize. If the relationship is broken, the customer may decide that he does not want to get his business mixed up in the unscrambling process and select neither of the two unmerged banks but a different bank, and in all probability, a larger one.

If this pattern of shifting to a larger bank in lieu of the unmerged banks prevailed, what effect would this have on competition? Instead of increasing competition, it is likely that unmerging of banks would lead to an increase in concentration in banking. This cannot be in the public interest.

Few observers believe the Justice Department would attempt to break up the 2,000-

odd bank mergers that have taken place since 1950. It would certainly create chaos in the financial system. But here again the question is one of equity and fair play. Should the Justice Department question some mergers and not others when they were approved by the same Federal authorities under the same law? After all we boast loud and long about being a government of laws and not of men.

The American Bankers Association strongly urges that all bank mergers which have been consummated, after receiving the approval of appropriate regulatory authorities, including those now being challenged in courts, be permitted to stand.

CONCLUSION

The executive council of the American Bankers Association, the ruling body of the association with members representing all divisions, sections, and committees of the ABA and all States in the Union, unanimously supports S. 1696. I request permission to insert the resolution in the record of these hearings. Many State bankers associations have taken similar action and indications are that others will do the same. Mr. Chairman, these actions by the ABA, which represents 88 percent of the Nation's commercial banks, plus the support coming from State bankers associations, demonstrate without doubt that the banking industry favors this legislation.

In our judgment, the present state of confusion in the field of bank mergers must be eliminated so that bankers can get back to their main task—meeting fully and efficiently the financial needs of the American economy. S. 1696 can clarify the whole situation and I urge its prompt passage. Thank you very much.

FE-000 M16E SUPPORT OF PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S POLICIES ON SOUTHEAST ASIA

Mr. McQUE. Mr. President, it is encouraging to see large segments of the American press underscore the wide acceptance and approval of our President's policies in southeast Asia. It is encouraging to see many newspapers spread the message which is so essential; namely, that the United States of America seeks peace, and is anxious to help the people of South Vietnam and all other peoples of southeast Asia, to raise their heads and their standard of living.

Last Thursday, America's policies were again effectively enunciated by President Johnson, who, in speaking to a national television audience, gave the message that we will meet force with force, as we must, in order to restore peace and order, though we remain ever willing to take part in unconditional talks aimed at settlement of the war in southeast Asia.

I ask unanimous consent that editorials commenting on President Johnson's speech, from the Cincinnati Enquirer, the Washington Evening Star, and the Washington Daily News, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

(From the Cincinnati Enquirer, May 14, 1965)

L.B.J. GONE TO THE PEOPLE

President Johnson, in his televised speech on Thursday, was dueling with left-leaning intellectuals for support by the people of his policies in Vietnam.

Mr. Johnson, harkening back to the days of Theodore Roosevelt's big stick and soft

May 20, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

10665

back is attempting to prove to Communist aggressors that the United States will meet force with force, that armed conquest is futile and that aggression is not only wrong but will not work.

Opponents of the President's policy are attempting to arouse public opposition to Mr. Johnson's Vietnam policy by marching, picketing and demonstrating.

The Enquirer, on Thursday morning, published on page 1 a picture of an example of this. It was a photograph of some of the hundreds who marched through Washington Wednesday, picketed the Pentagon and conferred with Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara. The group pleaded for negotiation, not bombs, to settle the war in Vietnam.

Another example, also a picture, was published in the Enquirer on Tuesday. This was the placard-picketing on Monday of the estate of Dr. Joseph Link in Mount Washington when Vice President Humphrey and some 300 Democratic leaders were gathered there.

President Johnson in his Thursday speech, repeated his call for unconditional discussions in quest of a settlement of the war but emphasized also that Red China, which is the settler behind North Vietnam, is not interested in a fulfillment of a desire by the Vietnamese for nationalism but in gaining control of all of Asia.

The President renewed his pledge to search for every possible path to peace and expressed again his interest in relieving the human needs and improving the lot of the Vietnamese people in their struggle for survival.

There is reason to fear, however well meaning some of those who march against Mr. Johnson may be, that there may be a subtle undercurrent of encouragement for their efforts because those efforts serve our calculating foes rather than the United States.

Returning again to "Teddy" Roosevelt, let us quote:

"Far better it is to dare mighty things, to win glorious triumphs, even though checkered by failure, than to take rank with those poor spirits who neither enjoy much nor suffer much, because they live in the gray twilight that knows not victory nor defeat." Negotiation, unless it is backed by power, strength, and resolve, is only a show of weakness to a powerful and predatory enemy power. In that context it is in the "gray twilight," to use the first President Roosevelt's words.

President Johnson, we conclude anew from his Thursday remarks, is trying to be a strong President who directs the course of events, rather than allowing them to direct him, in the interests of the safety of the people of this Nation. We believe he is right and we recommend that the people give to him their backing rather than give it to those who would have us lead from weakness rather than strength.

[From the Washington Evening Star, May 14, 1965]

AN EFFECTIVE APPEAL

There are those who think, and perhaps rightly so, that the President is making too many speeches in his attempt to explain, defend, and justify his policies in Vietnam. To some, the personality image which emerges from the television screen is not appealing. In our opinion, however, his televised address to the editorial cartoonists, in terms of content, was effective.

Mr. Johnson began by saying again, without any qualification, that we will not abandon our commitment to South Vietnam. It is desirable to plant this firmly in the minds of the enemy. He also restated his readiness to enter into unconditional discussions for a

settlement of the war. This, too, needs to be stamped indelibly upon the consciousness of friend and foe alike.

Most impressive, however, was the President's enumeration of the material improvements which have been made since 1954 in South Vietnam under what he correctly described as "circumstances of staggering adversity."

Mr. Johnson spelled them out in this fashion: In South Vietnam, always the rice bowl of Asia, rice production has been doubled. A new variety of sweetpotato has been introduced, promising a sixfold yield. Corn output should rise from 25,000 tons in 1952 to 100,000 tons by 1965. Pig production has more than doubled since 1955.

In South Vietnam, where life expectancy is 35 years, there are 200 doctors for 16 million people. In the United States there are 5,000 doctors for an equivalent number. So we are helping to build a medical school which will graduate 200 South Vietnamese doctors each year. More than 12,000 hamlet health stations have been built and stocked. More than 7 million people have been vaccinated against cholera and millions more against other diseases. There has also been much progress in the area of public education. To cite but one illustration, elementary school enrollment has risen from 300,000 in 1955 to more than 1,500,000 today. And, on the business front, a country which was virtually without industry 12 years ago now has more than 700 new or rehabilitated factories. And all of this work has gone on and will go on despite the costly, cruel war and the terrorist tactics of the Vietcong.

This may not be especially impressive in rich, overfed America. But as the message gets through, its import will not be lost upon millions of Asians who are reared in ignorance, racked by disease and whose lives are spent on the razor's edge of starvation. To them, the reference to corn and pigs will not be a joking matter.

The President concluded by saying that when peace finally comes we are ready to share this effort and this progress "with all the people of Vietnam—North and South alike." This was an appropriate note to strike. One must hope it is a note that will be heard in Hanoi.

[From the Washington Daily News, May 14, 1965]

L.B.J. MAKES HIS CASE ELOQUENTLY

President Johnson never has done a more persuasive job on an issue than he did Thursday in his TV appearance to detail again the whys and hows of United States policy in Vietnam.

Some seem to think the President is making these repeated enunciations of our purpose in Vietnam because a few vociferous professors and others keep ragging him on the subject. L.B.J. isn't going to reverse this particular brand of nonthinking—but addresses such as Thursday's can do a lot to solidify national understanding.

Moreover, this puts it up to the Communists once more. They show no more sign of relenting than the college hecklers. But there are other people in the world who do have open minds.

Our policy, the way Mr. Johnson stated it Thursday, is positive, not merely defensive.

Our preferred priority is on helping the South Vietnamese (and others in southeast Asia) to improve their lot. Since 1954, for instance, rice production has been doubled, new crops introduced, industrial production developed. This all would be much more meaningful, and farther along, except for the Communists who murder and pillage and force the Vietnamese and the United States to concentrate on military defense.

Americans would much rather devote

some of their resources to helping others with their economy and their standard of living. Our heavy expenditures on weapons are not by choice, but through necessity.

All the same, the President is still willing to sit down and talk it out.

The North Vietnamese obviously are hard to convince. Probably because for so many of the years this war has been going on they have been getting off easy, giving them the idea the United States was merely a "paper tiger" and that eventually they could overwhelm the South Vietnamese.

The President's purpose is to disabuse them of both notions—meanwhile being ready to negotiate and even readier to get on with peaceful ways to better life in southeast Asia, a program which would be far more useful to us and to the Asians than fighting.

There is nothing new or strange in this double-edged policy. This is what we did during and after World War II. We went all out to win and when the military job was finished we turned an enormous share of our effort and resources toward peaceful development around the world.

PROPOSED CUT IN SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE APPROPRIATIONS UNWISE

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, in the April issue of American Forests magazine there is an editorial which I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate. The editorial, entitled "Budget's 'Bombshell,'" is in opposition to the \$20 million proposed cut in the appropriations for the Soil Conservation Service.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

BUDGET'S "BOMBHELL"

The Bureau of the Budget has not shown good judgment in cutting the technical assistance program of the Soil Conservation Service by \$20 million. Hearings should be called to give the conservation public an opportunity to be heard on a proposal that would impede the forward advance of an old line and fundamental conservation program if allowed to stand. The proposal should be defeated and, in the light of recent developments, more technical assistance provided for. At a time when new conservation proposals are being heard regarding beautification of America great care must be taken to see to it that basic programs are not damaged in the process.

There are reasons galore why this cut is unwise at this particular time. With new dust storms billowing up in the West this is obviously no time to cut back on the never-ending task of anchoring soil in place. As this magazine has pointed out on more than one occasion many western acres are in a deplorable condition and need help. While recent efforts by a variety of hard-hitting agencies are hopeful signs, this task of land stabilization has to be an across-the-board effort and the Soil Conservation Service program is a basic part of that effort.

A consistent conservation posture on the part of the administration is most important. When an impartial study group recently informed the administration that Negro farmers are getting the short end of the stick on agricultural aid efforts and that something should be done about it, the administration immediately concurred. Something certainly should be done, but a proposal to lop off \$20 million from the technical aid program would not appear to be con-

10792

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

May 20, 1965

complete surprise when the rebellion was taken over—as it appears now—by Marxists. But for Johnson's hard diplomacy, the Caribbean might well be witnessing an extension of Castro's rule, and we hope the OAS will be sufficiently impressed as to take collective security measures of its own.

FE UTV Hall
OUR RESPONSIBILITIES IN VIETNAM AND THE WORLD

(Mr. HULL (at the request of Mr. FARNLEY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, in his historic speech at the Johns Hopkins University on April 7, President Johnson said this about the situation in Vietnam and about our responsibilities elsewhere in the world:

We fight because we must if we are to live in a world where every country can shape its own destiny. And only in such a world will our own freedom be finally secure.

We must deal with the world as it is, if it is ever to be as we wish.

In the long history of the world, despotism has become a venerable institution—but freedom is still young. If we are to see liberty succeed and prevail in the world, I believe we must be prepared for many a long and bitter struggle in its defense.

I have no illusions about the difficulty of those struggles. But the knowledge of our President's resolute and resourceful actions in matters of foreign policy has given me confidence recently. Fortunately many other Americans—newspaper editors among them—agree; today I would like to offer for the Record an editorial from the St. Joseph, Mo., Gazette of April 28:

L.B.J.'s Message

Once again, at his news conference yesterday, President Lyndon B. Johnson set forth in easily understandable terms the purposes which guide his decisions regarding southeast Asia and the conflict in South Vietnam.

The primary intent, one which has been voiced by this country for all the years since the end of World War II, is to block the swallowing-up of free and independent countries by communism through subversion fed and financed by their Communist neighbors.

Overthrow of free governments by terrorism in the streets, across the countryside in hamlets and farming areas, hit-and-run tactics of guerrilla gangs is the Communist idea of "war of liberation." Communism has openly pledged to support such wars as a means of subverting the entire world to that ideology.

It was Castro's tactic. Indonesia practiced it to gain control of independent areas in that Pacific region. And, although Sukarno disclaims communism, he is associated with Russia and Red China and continues to send his guerrilla bands into areas of Malaysia in an effort to further subvert free people. The same tactic disrupts many governments of Latin and South America.

By refusing to bow to terrorist takeover of a nation this country pledged to support as a neutral product of the 1954 agreements on Indochina, President Johnson is telling the world—and communism specifically—that Communist inspired "war of liberation" will not be condoned. He is telling the world that such armed assault on a neighbor, led by convoys along back roads and by shadowy ships which slink at night along the coast, is just as much aggression as attack by marching armies.

He is telling the world that the United States will no longer be taken in by the term "war of liberation."

ABOLITION OF RESIDENCE IN AID TO THE BLIND BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARSWAGA). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. KING) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to eliminate residence as an eligibility requirement to receive aid to the blind in the federally supported State programs of aid to the blind.

My bill does not embody a novel concept, nor does it represent a departure from our accepted practices and established legal provisions. Rather, it is completely consistent with our American traditions and constitutional precepts that an American is a citizen of the entire land, not just of a bordered part; that the whole Nation is his domain; that he may travel from State to State without restriction or restraint, seeking his fortune where he will, abandoning an old life of frustration and failure for a new life of promise and challenging hope.

By tradition and by legal concept and provision, an American is a citizen of all America, and all America is his homeland, he may establish his home in any part of America.

The greatness of America has come, in no small measure, from the free movement of its people—from East to Midwest, from Midwest to Far West—from farms to factories—from centers of static society, stagnant economy, to the very edge of the wilderness, where life—fluid and unfixed—offered opportunity for all who dreamed and hoped for the one new and better chance, and found it waiting for them.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, America has grown to greatness because its people held full rights of citizenship throughout the whole Nation, and they were free to go wherever fortune beckoned them from the life they knew—a life of failure or success; a life low or high in station—to the challenge of new lands and new industries, new hopes fulfilled, new dreams transformed into reality, a life that put renewed vitality into old and weary aspirations.

The full width and length of America should always be—must always be—the open and unrestricted domain of all Americans if we are to continue to grow and develop as a nation—and this should be so, must be so, whether a man is in need of public help or is prosperous; whether he is rich or poor; highly trained and skilled in a trade, business, or profession, or without any training or skill at all, but still is desirous of trying once more in a new place to find his place; to build his life in a new locality, in a different field of economic endeavor.

Mr. Speaker, I have long been an opponent of residence laws in programs of public welfare, for they freeze a man in his place; deny to him the right to go somewhere else, to try again in spite of ill fortune or adversity, to seek again for the realization of his shattered hopes and scattered dreams in a fresh assault on life in a strange land and among stran-

gers—a strange land to him, but nevertheless a part of vast America—strangers to him, but still his fellow Americans.

It is my belief that all Americans must possess the right to move freely where their dreams lead them in America; where opportunity invites them in America.

This right to move freely throughout America should not be denied to men in need who have their sight; it certainly should not be denied to men in need who are without their sight.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to a requirement in all Federal-State public welfare programs that, to qualify for aid, a person must live in a State for a specified length of time.

I am particularly opposed to such a residence requirement in the federally supported aid to the blind programs provided for under title X of the Social Security Act.

Over the years, Congress has endeavored to make the Federal-State aid to the blind programs a means by which needy blind persons might be helped to achieve rehabilitation—might ultimately free themselves through their own efforts from a lifetime of dependency upon public assistance; might free the community of the obligation of providing support for them the remaining years of their lives.

Abolition of residence requirements in the Federal-State aid to the blind programs would be another forward step in making these programs truly programs offering a means of achieving full rehabilitation to normal, productive lives.

The bill I have introduced would abolish residence requirements in aid to the blind programs in the States.

It would restore to men and women who are blind and dependent upon such programs a basic right of their American citizenship: the right to move anywhere in the country without loss or hazard, without forfeiture or restraint.

A man who has lost his sight still possesses an almost limitless capacity for profitable productivity, but because of the nature of the economic environment in which he resides he may be unable to find employment; because he is needy and dependent upon public sources for support, he cannot leave his home community or State, devoid of job opportunities for him, to reestablish himself in a more advantageous area of the Nation, because public assistance would not be available to him in the new State—since he would lack the years of residence in the new State to qualify him for such aid.

So, Mr. Speaker, this man remains in his barren community—barren for him—barren of employment opportunities for a man who is blind. And, because he dare not venture toward new horizons that offer him hope and a better future, but also offer only starvation until he can find work, until he can earn again—he remains where he happens to live and continues to live—not too well—but continues to live for the rest of his life as a public charge, a permanent recipient of public assistance.

Thus, this man who is blind, denied freedom of movement because he is needy and because of the restrictiveness of State laws, lives a lifetime of depend-

May 20, 1965

A2536

barrel of beer in the District of Columbia is only \$1.50.

Let us consider the matter of real estate taxes. I own a home here in the District of Columbia, for which I paid \$43,500, and it is only five blocks from the Capitol. The taxes on that piece of property are \$530. I also own a home in my hometown in Wisconsin for which the market value is \$26,000. I pay \$870 in property taxes on that home, or almost twice as much.

That gives an idea of the fact that the residents of the District of Columbia are not bearing their fair share of the burden of the tax load.

I have introduced today a bill to raise the real estate taxes by 40 cents per hundred; to raise the individual income taxes, which are "out of this world" compared to income taxes in many States and many localities; to increase the cigarette tax by 1 cent per pack; and to increase the beer tax to \$3.50 a barrel, which will still be \$4 less than in the State of Virginia.

If we pass this tax bill which I have introduced and give the city the \$50 million which is already authorized by law as a Federal payment, then for the first time in the 23 years I have been in Congress the District of Columbia finally will have enough revenue to do the job which needs to be done.

I hope that the Members of Congress will take a look at this bill and examine the tax structure and support my proposal.

**President Johnson's Policies in Vietnam
Have the Support of the American
Public**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has made it clear to the world that we will not be defeated in Vietnam but that we are willing to enter into discussion with our enemies in southeast Asia if they will do so in good faith. He has shown that we are ready to defend the freedom of Vietnam and we will take whatever steps are necessary to do so.

In this determination, our President has the support and backing of the American people. An editorial in the Beaumont Journal, an outstanding newspaper published in southeast Texas, expresses this support. The editorial which was printed April 28, 1965, follows:

[From the Beaumont (Tex.) Journal, Apr. 28, 1965]

It's Up To Them

Communist China's rejection of a British proposal to reconsider its refusal to allow Patrick Gordon Walker, former British foreign secretary, to visit Peking for talks on Vietnam is not surprising. Red Chinese leaders had rather fight than talk, probably because they know they couldn't find words to justify their actions in southeast Asia.

But they waste a lot of words in refusing

entry to Walker, touring southeast Asia as a special envoy on the Vietnam problem for Prime Minister Harold Wilson. Here's what they say in Hsinhua, the official Chinese press agency, about Britain's attitude on Vietnam and Walker's proposed visit:

"It [the British attitude] indicates the arrogance of the U.S. aggressors." For that reason, the agency explains, the request to allow Walker to visit Peking "cannot be given consideration."

The refusal dashes the faint hope that if the Chinese were ready to consider President Johnson's offer of unconditional discussions, the presence of Walker would give them a good opportunity to pass the word to the waiting world.

What the Communist Chinese leaders fail to see, or refuse to consider, is the President's determination to hold our ground in South Vietnam. Yet, in a recent ringing speech that echoed around the world, the President made it clear to everyone that "we will not be defeated."

The fact is that the United States is prepared to pursue either of two courses: To step up the shooting in Vietnam or stop it completely. We will escalate the war if the Communists continue their aggression. We will stop the shooting if they show a willingness to talk peace in good faith and on sensible and acceptable terms.

The choice is theirs, not ours. It is up to them to decide whether to widen the war or narrow it; whether to fire the guns or silence them.

The Dominican Revolt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, few Americans want to commit our boys to fight on foreign lands. But in many cases this action is a necessity. When such necessities arise, every American wants his President to act decisively.

I am proud that President Johnson had not flinched, but has exerted powerful and positive leadership. This was never more true than when the President's mettle was tested in the Dominican Republic.

The necessity for American intervention was evident. The actions of President Johnson were truly those of a great statesman, and a great leader.

President Johnson made it clear about our purposes in sending marines into the Dominican Republic. America supports neither side in the Dominican dispute, only the side of freedom and democracy. We support self-determination without the subversive influence of international communism.

I am proud of the decisiveness which President Johnson displayed and I am sure his actions paved the way for progress and peace in that small but important nation.

At this time, with permission, I include in the Record two editorials which comment on America's actions in the Dominican crisis. They are the April 28 editorial from the Chicago American, and the May 6 editorial from the Omaha World-Herald.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) American, Apr. 29, 1965]

THE DOMINICAN REVOLT

President Johnson displayed good sense and firmness in ordering a Navy task force and 400 Marines to the Dominican Republic to protect and evacuate Americans. Not only were more than 1,000 U.S. nationals rescued, but the presence of the fleet, including the carrier *Essex*, undoubtedly helped to stabilize the confused Dominican situation.

In the past, a similar demonstration by American ships helped to quell another Dominican revolt, that time against the junta which had ousted Dictator Rafael Trujillo. Whatever may be the criticism of our foreign policy elsewhere in the world, it seems we do know how to deal with the Dominican situations.

The present uprising demonstrates that the Dominican Republic has not quite come of age politically. But there are signs that this land, the cradle of Spanish civilization in the New World, may yet attain the stability that Venezuela, for example, has been demonstrating in recent years. Caracas, too, has had some recent violence, but on the whole, there has been a continuum of government that in Latin America amounts to stability.

The latest assault on the Dominican Government seems to have occurred because the army commanders were dissatisfied with the economy edicts of the junta leader, Donald Reid-Cabral, who represents the ruling families of the island. They were opposed by the air force commander, Brig. Gen. Elias Wessin y Wessin. General Wessin led the coup that ousted Dr. Juan Bosch September 28, 1963, making way for President Reid. The navy also supported the government.

President Bosch had been accused of pro-communism, although his closest friends are such staunch anti-Communists as ex-Gov. Luis Muñoz Marín, of Puerto Rico, and ex-President Romulo Betancourt, of Venezuela. In the present uprising, in any event, three Communist parties in the Dominican Republic joined the army leaders in favoring the recall of Dr. Bosch.

Under the circumstances, the United States was forced to favor pro tempore President Reid, who was persona non grata with the United States immediately after the ouster of Dr. Bosch. Reid has been proving since that he wants to restore the economy of the Dominican Republic, and that he ultimately favors popular elections.

Also, he definitely will not let Fidel Castro's Communists get a foothold in the Republic. Reid at the moment is not in the new junta but he doubtless will be shortly.

The Communists, for their part, couldn't care less who was causing the upheaval. They supported Dr. Bosch as they support anyone who will destroy the existing order to make way for instability and ultimate communism. The prompt American action, and the support of the Government by the Dominican Air Force and Navy, may have given the ruling junta another chance to work for progress and peace.

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) Evening World-Herald, May 6, 1965]

A VICTORY FOR AMERICA

This has been a week of soul searching in America.

Columnists, commentators, editors, and barroom experts (the latter sometimes more realistic than their more learned brethren) have been examining and weighing Lyndon Johnson's blunt and brave words of last Sunday evening. They have been trying to determine whether this reaffirmation of the Monroe Doctrine in terms of the 20th century has enhanced or degraded the quality of America's leadership among the decent nations of the earth.

Naturally the conclusions vary as widely as the prejudices of those who draw them.

10658

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 20, 1965

of this occasion will live forever in my mind and heart.

I am deeply grateful for the honor you do me today. It will serve as an inspiration and as a source of strength to me. It will be a challenge to me in the tasks that lie ahead.

May I say that I am greatly impressed by the work and activities which I have been privileged to observe during our tour this afternoon. It is tremendously gratifying and encouraging to see such a dedicated staff, supported by such devoted public-spirited citizens, making visible progress in the training and rehabilitation of the unfortunate children under your loving care.

The work you have done here at Partridge has helped make the people of this Nation more aware of the problems of the mentally retarded and has provided an example of how to cope with these problems. Your work and selfless devotion have been a challenge to those of us in Congress who share the cause of mental retardation with you and have inspired us in our ever continuing efforts in behalf of assistance to States and communities to combat mental retardation and to encourage expansion in teaching and research in the education of mentally retarded children.

As you know, in 1963 we enacted the Mental Retardation Facilities Construction Act. That act authorizes construction assistance for research centers to combat mental retardation, university affiliated centers for the mentally retarded, and facilities for the care of the mentally retarded.

The scope of your Federal Government's activities in the mentally retarded field is evidenced by the fact that during the present fiscal year the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will expend \$239 million for mental retardation programs, half of this for research, demonstrations, professional training, services, and instruction, and half for income maintenance of mentally retarded persons. In contrast, 10 years ago, the total amount spent for mental retardation programs was \$22 million. For the next fiscal year, the President has asked Congress to appropriate \$280 million for these purposes. As chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee of the Senate handling this request, I believe I can assure you that the appropriation will be made.

To all of us who are so deeply concerned with mental retardation, to you here at Partridge who have done so much to help combat it, it is indeed distressing to realize that by 1970 there will be an anticipated 6½ million mentally retarded persons in the United States. It is even more distressing to face the realization that in three out of four mentally retarded cases we do not know the cause of the problem.

Yes, we have made a good start, we have made progress, and yet, from the figures I have just cited, we see how much more there is to be done, how great the challenge is for the future.

I am glad to tell you here today that I have confidence we will pass legislation, which I have been privileged to introduce, to greatly expand the facilities of the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration. Vested with the responsibility for the progress of this fine school, you will be interested to know that this bill authorizes grants to pay part of the costs of constructing rehabilitation facilities and sheltered workshops, as well as grants to help pay for the initial operating costs. It will provide training grants, including stipends for trainees in workshops, project grants for the improvement of sheltered workshops, and technical assistance to workshops.

With the assistance of a National Policy and Performance Council created under the bill, the States will be helped to expand and extend their vocational rehabilitation programs, and their research and development work.

More important, the legislation provides that vocational rehabilitation evaluation services may extend to a maximum period of 18 months during which the employment potential of any affected individual may be determined. Under present law, these services cannot be furnished a disabled person unless it is first determined that the service will actually prepare him to fill a paying job. As we know, particularly for the mentally retarded, this requirement works a hardship; the new liberalization will permit more persons to be prepared for productive lives.

Here at Partridge, you are giving hope and comfort to disabled children. You are giving them the help without which they would be forever denied their just measure of life's potential.

I congratulate you and again salute you on your great work and on the humanitarian spirit that inspires it. As I stand here with you today, I cannot but be reminded of the words of the old Greek philosopher who declared: "One cannot get closer to God than by bringing health to one's fellow man."

With profound gratitude to you for the honor that you do me, with heartfelt appreciation for the wonderful work that you have done, I say to you that in the confidence of knowledge, in the strength of integrity, in the tenderness of sympathy, in the fellowship of humility, and in the love of God, we shall go forward together in the battle for our mentally retarded, for our children who so much need our help. For, it was the Master who said to us, "Suffer the little children to come unto Me, for of such is the Kingdom of Heaven."

REASONS FOR U.S. ACTIONS IN DOMINICAN REPUBLIC CRISIS

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, the newspapers of the Nation have done an exceptional job of reporting and commenting on the reasons for U.S. actions in the Dominican Republic crisis.

The Nation's editors have almost unanimously supported President Johnson's policies and moves in that troubled island country.

In the final analysis, the two basic factors underlying the President's actions were to protect American lives, and subsequently to thwart communism in its effort to control the Dominican Government.

As the May 4 editorial in the Nashville Tennessean pointed out:

President Johnson moved courageously in the face of certain criticism and widespread misunderstanding to prevent an apparent Communist takeover in the Dominican Republic and guarantee that nation a chance to form a democratic government.

The Richmond Times-Dispatch in a May 5 editorial noted that President Johnson's decisive response to the Communists certainly slowed the Red subversion in Latin America.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record these two editorials and also an editorial published in the Cheyenne, Wyo., Eagle of May 7.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Nashville Tennessean, May 4, 1965]

PRESIDENT'S FIRM ACTION POINTS THE WAY FOR OAS

The administration has properly laid emphasis upon the role that needs to be played by the Organization of American States in dealing with the crisis in the Dominican Republic.

The President acted firmly Sunday in doing what was necessary in the face of mounting intelligence reports that Communists were taking over the Dominican revolution. He made it unmistakably clear that the hemisphere will not under any condition permit another Cuba, and that there was no time to lose in ordering American forces to the island to prevent a takeover and protect foreign nationals.

But then the President appealed to other Latin American nations—and particularly the members of the OAS—to join with this country in performing what is essentially a hemispheric duty. He repeatedly stressed the fact that citizens of 30 foreign countries in the Dominican Republic were enjoying protection of American troops and hinted strongly that it was the duty of these other countries—as well as that of the United States—to participate in the keeping of order.

Mr. Johnson certainly was aware of the criticism he risked by undertaking this emergency action, and the criticism was not long in coming. The action was attacked by Cuba, Communist China, and—in the United Nations—by the Soviet bloc. While criticism from these nations was to be expected, the reaction of other Latin American nations undoubtedly is the thing that is uppermost in the President's mind.

For the most part, the reaction of other members of the OAS has been encouraging. There has been criticism from some Latin American countries, but this is likely to be mitigated as the danger posed by the Dominican situation is fully disclosed.

Mr. Johnson took special pains Sunday night to explain that this country's only interest in the Dominican Republic—or anywhere else in Latin America—is its determination to prevent the establishment of another Communist regime and to provide the afflicted nations with the opportunity to order their own democratic governments.

This means that the citizens of weak and poverty-stricken Latin American nations must be protected not only from Communist invaders but also from corrupt and dictatorial internal regimes that deprive the people of their rights and the resources of their countries. To do this requires the effort of all Latin America.

It would be all but impossible for the United States to attempt to police all of the potential trouble areas in Latin America alone. For one thing, this would be strategically unwise, permitting the Communists to scatter our forces while they increased the pressure in Southeast Asia or some other place. Too, it would create resentments that could only intensify the unrest.

President Johnson moved courageously in the face of certain criticism and widespread misunderstanding to prevent an apparent Communist takeover in the Dominican Republic and guarantee that nation a chance to form a democratic government.

How well the Dominican future turns out depends to a large extent upon the people themselves and upon the cooperative spirit of the rest of Latin America. The President acted in an emergency and he acted in the interest of all the hemisphere. But it is time for the Organization of American States to recognize that protection of the hemisphere is everybody's business, and get on with the planning for such emergencies in the future. It appears that there may be quite a few of them.

[From the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch, May 5, 1965]

LATIN AMERICA MAY LIKE IT

The "domino theory" that has been applied to southeast Asia might well have become operative for Latin America, if the United States had stood idly by, and let the Communists take over the Dominican Republic. Once the Reds found that we would not move forcefully to stop them, they would

May 20, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

10657

in bombing enemy installations substantially impaired.

The commanding general of this airbase, according to news reports, has stated that there was no evidence of sabotage. Let a thorough inquiry disclose whether or not this was the case. If there is no evidence of sabotage, then it would seem evident that there was flagrant failure on the part of the commanding officer in this area to properly safeguard the handling of the bombs and to protect our bombers and the lives of our soldiers and airmen.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The 3 minutes of the Senator from Ohio have expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, among the missing and presumably dead Americans at Bienhoa is Capt. Ernie McFeron, of San Antonio, Tex., an Army demolition expert. His wife has made public some of her husband's letters deploring the lack of safeguards against possible accidental explosions at Bien Hoa and the fact that some personnel, both American and South Vietnamese, were permitted to handle bombs before being adequately trained for the purpose. The Associated Press report of the interview appeared in newspapers throughout the Nation. I ask unanimous consent that the news item which appeared in the Washington Evening Star entitled "Bomb Handlers Inept, Blast Victim Wrote," be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**BIENHOA STORY—BOMB HANDLERS INEPT
BLAST VICTIM WROTE**

SAN ANTONIO, TEX.—An Army demolition expert who apparently died in the bomb explosion at Bienhoa in South Vietnam had written home that untrained men were handling bombs at the airbase his wife says.

A chain explosion of bombs in U.S. planes Sunday left 27 Americans dead or missing and 103 wounded. Among the missing was Capt. Ernie McFeron, 30, of San Antonio.

Mrs. Mary McFeron made public some of her husband's letters Monday in an interview.

In one letter, McFeron spoke of a fellow American officer who played a key role in disarming bombs and supervising the loading of United States and Vietnamese bombers although he was untrained in demolition work with conventional weapons.

The officer, McFeron wrote, "had never even seen a bomb of this type up close before he got here. And now he thinks he knows everything there is to know about them."

McFeron said he was afraid to work with the man but had to.

Mrs. McFeron reported this man had received some training in nuclear demolition but none with conventional weapons being employed in Vietnam.

Much of McFeron's criticism was directed at the Vietnamese, but the casualties in the chain explosion indicated few Vietnamese were in the vicinity when the first bomb exploded as it was being loaded aboard a U.S. Canberra jet bomber. In contrast to the

130 Americans killed, missing, and wounded, 1 Vietnamese was reported killed and 7 injured.

In a letter dated April 19, McFeron wrote:

"The Vietnamese Air Force had an accident yesterday.

"They had a trailer load of bombs which detonated. Four Vietnamese airmen were killed and two of four boys were hurt.

"Part of our storage area and some of our equipment was destroyed. The Vietnamese had a similar accident about a week ago at Bienhoa, but nobody was hurt.

"I am surprised that they haven't had more—the way they handle munitions.

"We have told them several times that if they weren't careful they would have an accident.

"But they won't pay any attention to us. When they handle munitions we pull our people out of the area.

"I hope by now they have learned their lesson. But I am afraid they haven't."

DISGUSTED

Captain McFeron wasn't a complainer by nature, his wife said Monday.

But he frequently wrote, "I've never been so disgusted in my life."

His wife has resigned herself to "the inevitable."

Mrs. McFeron has told only the oldest of her four children what may have happened to their father.

The 8-year-old girl apparently understands as well as any child can.

"What are we going to do now if we don't have a daddy?" she asks.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Unquestionably, our people are entitled to have the truth searched out and to be fully informed as to the facts. I urge that a committee of U.S. Senators be appointed without delay for this purpose.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR LISTER HILL

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to another in the long list of honors and citations given to my colleague, the senior Senator from Alabama, the Honorable LISTER HILL, for his efforts on behalf of mentally retarded children. On Saturday, May 8, Senator HILL was given a citation by the advisory board of the Partridge Schools and Rehabilitation Center, a residential facility serving 65 students with brain damage and other forms of retardation. It is located on a 550-acre farm near Warrenton, Va., and is in its 11th year of operation. The citation was given in gratitude "for the advances in the care and treatment of mental handicaps and mental illness that have come about in recent years, a development which has been impressively stimulated and implemented by the Senator's work in the Congress."

The citation is as follows:

CITATION

The advisory board of the Partridge Schools and Rehabilitation Center is proud to confer its sixth annual citation upon you, the Honorable LISTER HILL, Senator from the State of Alabama and chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, for your dedicated service and effective leadership in developing national programs for protecting and improving the health and medical care of the American people. To your position and stature in the U.S. Senate and in the Nation, you have brought a deep and probing understanding of the health needs of the Nation. As the person

primarily responsible for the strength and effectiveness of our Federal programs in the field of physical and mental health, your untiring efforts have brought better health and renewed hope to millions of Americans.

With the Partridge Schools' special interest in the problems of mental retardation, we are particularly grateful for the advances in the care and treatment of mental handicaps and mental illness that have come about in recent years, a development which has been impressively stimulated and implemented by your work in the Congress.

With this citation, we express to you, Senator HILL, the appreciation of our children, who cannot speak for themselves, and the earnest hopes of their families for the continuing exploration and ultimate alleviation of the problem.

Mr. President, the five prior recipients of this annual citation were: Dr. Stafford Warren, White House adviser on mental retardation; Mrs. Agnes E. Meyer, outstanding writer and leader in the field of social service and education; Dr. Richard Auld, of the Georgetown Medical Center; Mrs. Eunice Kennedy Shriver, on behalf of the Kennedy family; and Judge Hugh Reid, of the Arlington County juvenile court, one of the original directors of the George Everett Partridge Memorial Foundation, sponsor of the Partridge schools. Mr. Julius N. Cahn, first chairman of the Partridge advisory board, now on the staff of Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, received a special award in 1961.

The citation was presented at the occasion of open house when the program of the center for brain-damaged, retarded, and emotionally disturbed children and youth was demonstrated. Senator HILL toured the center and saw children performing tasks which they had been taught under Federal programs which he had sponsored in Congress.

The part of this proceeding, however, which merits special attention and which I heartily commend to your most serious study are the brief remarks made by Senator HILL upon his receipt of this citation. These remarks show the Senator's profound understanding of the still unsolved problems in the field of mental retardation and his continued efforts to solve those problems. Most importantly, however, these remarks should give new hope to the retarded for a more complete share of the things life has to offer and renewed determination to those tens of thousands of people, like the dedicated and devoted staff members at the Partridge School, who are working with retarded children. The time is approaching when through research we will know far more than we do today on what causes mental retardation, how to deal with it and hopefully how to prevent it or greatly reduce its incidence.

I ask unanimous consent to have my colleague's remarks included at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR LISTER HILL, PARTRIDGE SCHOOLS AND REHABILITATION CENTER, MAY 8, 1965

Luke, the beloved physician, tells us that one of life's sorrows is the impermanence of its joys. I can tell you, however, that the joy

May 20, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

10655

which have used the release programs, and have benefited by them; and the bill also is based on the experience with the halfway houses for young inmates in the Federal prison systems in Los Angeles, Chicago, Detroit, and New York City.

Only last week, this body passed Senate bill 1319, to authorize a work-release program for persons sentenced by the courts of the District of Columbia. In the committee report on this bill it is noted that apart from the money to be saved from the daily expenses of inmates, the bill would assure "continued contributions toward the inmate's family's financial support, and reduce the likelihood of relief or welfare costs for his dependents."

During the past several years, newspapers and magazines throughout the country have reported on the progress of the North Carolina work-release plan. In these reports, one fact stands out: North Carolina is the only State in the United States with a declining prison population. Furthermore, employers of inmates under the North Carolina work-release program consistently express satisfaction with the work and the conduct of their employees.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that certain articles relating to the North Carolina work-release program be printed at this point in the RECORD, to lend encouraging support for this proposed legislation. One of these articles is entitled "Prisoners, Outside on the Job"; it was published in Time magazine for September 14, 1962; another is entitled "Prisoners Work in Outside Jobs—Rehabilitation Is Spurred by North Carolina Program"; it is from the New York Times for August 18, 1963. The last one is entitled "North Carolina Prisoners Support Families—Learn Skills in Work-Release Plan"; it is from the Washington Post for April 8, 1963.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 18, 1963]
PRISONERS WORK IN OUTSIDE JOBS—REHABILITATION IS SPURRED BY NORTH CAROLINA PROGRAM

RALEIGH, N.C., August 17.—On the job, 22-year-old — looks like any other \$50-a-week service station attendant. He pumps gas, checks oil, cleans windshields.

His blue-denim company uniform and western-style black boots hide the fact that he is a convict, serving 3 to 5 years for breaking and entering.

— is 1 of more than 560 prisoners enrolled in the North Carolina rehabilitation program called work release.

He holds an outside job during working hours and spends his off-duty time in confinement. His earnings support his wife and three young children and provide him a nest egg for use when he is freed.

Work release is the showcase item in a State prison reform program that has shifted the emphasis, in less than 10 years, from punishment to rehabilitation.

ECONOMY AND HOPE

"As a dollar and cents proposition, it's a good thing for the taxpayer," State Prisons Director George Randall said, "but there's also the humanitarian aspect." He explained:

"Under the old concept, prison was supposed to degrade a man—the ball and chain, stripes, things like that. Now we try to

build him up. When a man supports his family, it gives him a degree of self-respect and is helpful in rehabilitation.

"You can't put a dollar value on giving a man hope and restoring him to the community with a chance."

— dropped out of high school in the 10th grade, married early, began a family and ran into financial trouble. That makes him a typical beneficiary of the program. He shares Mr. Randall's faith in its possibilities.

"Since I've been here, I've gotten a different outlook on things," he says. "They don't treat you like a convict. They don't hold it over you. It's just like I had come off the streets and gotten a job."

His employer, — has hired several prisoners and plans to keep — on after he is paroled.

State policy is predicated on the calculation that it costs 12 times as much to keep a man behind bars as it does to supervise him on parole or probation.

Work release, which was begun on a statewide basis in 1957, smooths the parole process. It also attempts to eliminate the broken homes, joblessness and lack of money that so often result in prison repeaters.

North Carolina is the only State with a declining prison population. From a high of 12,046 convicts in December 1961, the total has dropped to 10,668 by last June 28.

Employers across the State have recently begun cooperating to a surprising extent, said Louis Poole, assistant supervisor of inmate employment. "We just do not have enough skilled prisoners to fill all the job requests."

Prisoners have worked in the trades, as store clerks, auto salesmen, and laborers, and in many other occupations.

Salaries range as high as \$140 a week. The average is between \$50 and \$60.

Successful alumni include a court reporter for the State industrial commission and a mechanic who used his savings to open a business in eastern North Carolina, and is now hiring work-release prisoners.

In addition to its placement duties, Mr. Poole's office is responsible for determining that the wages paid the prisoners compare favorably with prevailing rates.

Take-home pay is left at each prison unit's office. The State retains \$2.25 a day to defray the cost of housing and feeding the convict. So far, this alone has resulted in a saving of more than \$337,000 to North Carolina taxpayers.

The prisoner also is assessed the cost of transportation to and from work, if provided by the State. He receives a few dollars to take care of personal expenses.

The balance of his earnings is split, with some money ear-marked for family support and the rest for the prisoner's trust fund.

Under the frequently amended law, all convicts are eligible to participate. However, the prisons department excludes sex offenders, dope addicts, and prisoners housed in maximum custody units.

Work release has also been used for some time in Pennsylvania counties and cities, particularly Pittsburgh and Lancaster.

[From Time magazine, Sept. 14, 1962]

PRISON: OUTSIDE ON THE JOB

They're like everybody else—almost. They go to work each weekday morning, serve communities throughout North Carolina as barbers, mechanics, cooks, secretaries, and farmers. Then they go home—to their cells in State prisons. There are 306 of them, and they are convicts taking part in North Carolina's promising work-lease program, a rehabilitation plan based on the idea that a prisoner with a steady outside job is of greater benefit both to himself and the State.

Begun tentatively in 1957, North Carolina's system has evolved under State Prison Director George W. Randall into the most liberal outside work plan in the Nation. All

inmates with sentences of 5 years or less are eligible for consideration, provided they are not sex offenders, confirmed alcoholics or drug addicts. Each prisoner's weekly paycheck is turned over to the State, which gives him \$5 for personal expenses, keeps \$1 for State-furnished transportation—and \$2.25 a day for room and board. The remainder is divided up between the prisoner's family and a trust fund that he receives on completing his sentence. Some of North Carolina's working prisoners:

—, a forger, tears down automobiles in a junkyard. "You have a feeling of security out here," says —. "There's not someone breathing down your neck. We don't have to worry about a thing. We turn in our check, and that settles everything."

—, convicted of breaking and entering, makes \$50 a week as a cook at a café in Raleigh. Says he: "It bothered me at first—getting locked up at night. I've got used to it now, and it's just another day. The girls coming in—that's the most tempting part, but I'll be out in February."

—, convicted of forcible trespassing, performed so well on the job at the — restaurant that he was hired when he was paroled last week. Said motel owner —: "I'm going to use more prisoners in the future. They're harder workers and better than those that come in off the street for a job."

So far as is known, no prisoner has ever committed a crime while at work. Seven percent have been classified as "escapees"—a term that covers everything from leaving work to visit a friend to outright flight—and all have been returned to prison. Of convicts who have worked in the program and served their terms, only a handful have got into trouble after their release. Eventually, Randall hopes to have 1,000 prisoners outside on the job. Says he: "Under the old concept, prison was supposed to degrade a man—the ball and chain, stripes, things like that. Now we try to build him up. And as a dollars-and-cents proposition, it's a good thing for the taxpayer. The prisoner on work release actually pays his way through prison."

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 8, 1963]
UNIQUE AND REWARDING—NORTH CAROLINA PRISONERS SUPPORT FAMILIES; LEARN SKILLS IN WORK-RELEASE PLAN

(By Robert E. Baker)

RALEIGH, N.C.—A young wood-carver works in a shop near Asheville and earns \$130 a week.

A bricklayer works on a construction job in Raleigh at \$3 an hour and supports his 61-year-old mother. Another bricklayer here supports his wife and two children at his \$2.75-an-hour job.

These 3 men and more than 1,400 other North Carolina jobholders have one thing in common:

They are all inmates of the North Carolina prison system who work in the free community under the State's unique and rewarding work-release program.

It is part of an overall prison reform in North Carolina that is paying off. The Tarheel State's prison population is diminishing while the population in the prisons of the Federal Government, District of Columbia, and almost every growing State is rapidly increasing.

REACHED PEAK IN 1961

North Carolina's prison population reached an alltime high of more than 12,000 2 years ago. Today it is under 11,000—3,000 below the prediction made by experts in 1966.

One reason for the drop is that North Carolina's economy is improving; its people are better off.

But more important is the multiple attack against increasing prison populations launched by former Gov. Luther H. Hodges, accelerated by present Gov. Terry Sanford, and administered by George W. Randall, director of prisons.

10656

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 20, 1965

"Crime in the Nation is growing four times faster than the population," Randall said. "That shows the old ways don't work. We just had to do something else."

The overall program is designed to improve the preparation of prisoners for release through effective rehabilitation programs and increased use of parole.

SAVINGS OF \$800,000 IN YEAR

Taxpayers should like it. Because fewer former prisoners fail to live within the law, the taxpayers save money. The reduction of the State's prison population means North Carolina taxpayers will save more than \$800,000 this year. The prison department's budget request for the next 2 years is \$1.25 million less than had been expected.

"But more important than saving tax dollars," Randall said, "is the incalculable saving of human suffering. There is no way to measure the waste, heartaches, and human misery caused by crime."

One example of North Carolina's progressive prison program is the school attendance required for all inmates who have less than fourth-grade achievement level.

"The link between crime and lack of education is irrefutable," said Randall. "Of 541 youthful felons that we have, 512 were school dropouts."

MANY FINISH HIGH SCHOOL

Prisoners are encouraged to go beyond the fourth grade. Many have received the equivalent of high school certificates.

The alcoholic rehabilitation program is another example. Alcoholics Anonymous groups in the communities take their program into the various prisons.

"About 75 percent of our inmates are here because of an alcohol problem," Randall said. "This program has had fine results."

About 345 inmates who participated in the voluntary alcoholic rehabilitation program failed and came back to prison. But 2,000 others, followed closely by prison officials to see if it worked, remain in the free society and continue to participate in Alcoholics Anonymous outside.

Other programs include extension vocational training, mental health clinics in the prisons to help mentally disturbed inmates, expansive work and recreation systems.

WORK-RELEASE PROGRAM

But the eye catcher is the work-release program, unique in the United States.

This permits selected prisoners who are serving 5 years or less to work in the free community during working hours. Non-working hours are spent back in prison.

From the money they make, they pay the prison department for their cells and meals and the transportation to and from work. They support their families. Any money left over is deposited in a trust account for them when they are released from prison.

Many prisoners have \$1,800 to \$2,000 when they are released. Some have used the money for downpayments on new homes. A welder, serving 5 years for breaking and entering, was accepted in the work-release program and used the money he saved to establish his own business when released.

A printer with a wife and two children worked 3½ months in the work-release program and made \$1,075, minus taxes and social security.

He paid \$229 to the prison for housing and board, \$53 for transportation to and from his job, \$750 to support his family, and was released with \$43 in cash from the trust fund.

Inmates in the work-release program are actually paying their way through prison.

About 20 percent of the 8,000 prisoners now serving 5 years or less have been approved for the program. About 5 percent of those who are accepted are withdrawn for violations. Most violations fall into two categories: taking a drink or slipping off to see the wife.

Many of the inmates work for former employers. But many others learn a trade in prison and then are accepted for the work-release program for outside work. They are shifted to prisons near their employment.

Because participants in the program are able to support their families while in prison, when otherwise the dependents might be forced on the welfare rolls, families are saved. So are tax dollars. The prisoner has a job when he is released; the crime rate is reduced. Prisoners have an incentive to make a good record.

Public opinion was initially hesitant about the work-release program, but it is changing.

"Many people think the prisoner is a different breed of man," Randall said. "But that's not so. The prisoner is more like the average man on the street than most of us are willing to admit."

"People forget that 97 percent of our prisoners are going to be released. We simply ask: Is it better for them to come out with a job and self-respect and contribute to society, or to come out with nothing?"

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name may be added as a cosponsor of S. 1808 the next time the bill is printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, on February 24 I introduced S. 1272, a bill to increase to 60,000 miles the total mileage of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways. Joining me at that time were Mr. SYMINGTON and Mr. LONG of Missouri. I now ask unanimous consent that the name of Senator CARLSON may also be added as a cosponsor at the next printing of the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPROPRIATIONS TO DEFRAY COSTS OF ORGANIZING AND HOLDING 20TH ANNUAL WORLD HEALTH ASSEMBLY—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 11, 1965, the name of Mr. RUBINOFF was added as an additional cosponsor of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 80) to authorize appropriations to defray the costs of organizing and holding the 20th annual World Health Assembly in the United States, introduced by Mr. KENNEDY of New York on May 11, 1965.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON SENATE BILL 1808

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, I wish to announce that an ad hoc subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee will hold hearings on May 27 on S. 1808, to amend section 4082 of title 18, United States Code, to facilitate the rehabilitation of persons convicted of offenses against the United States. The hearings are scheduled for 10:30 a.m. in room 2228 of the New Senate Office Building. The subcommittee consists of Senator BURDICK, Senator HRUSKA, Senator SCOTT, and myself as chairman.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. HARTKE:

Article entitled "Historical Display Boards," written by R. N. Dosh and published in the Ocala (Fla.) Star-Banner of May 16, 1965.

BIENHOA DISASTER SHOULD BE INVESTIGATED

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the chain explosion of bombs at the strategic Bienhoa Air Force Base in South Vietnam was a disaster of horrendous magnitude. Twenty-seven Americans are dead and 103 wounded. More than 40 of our finest aircraft were utterly destroyed or damaged. Apparently a squadron, or even more jet bombers than comprise a squadron, of our most modern and most expensive jet bombers was crowded wingtip to wingtip on a runway on which protective revetments of a satisfactory character had not been constructed. This same airbase had previously been subject to a surprise attack from the Vietcong and American lives had been lost. Yet, apparently the commanding general and those officers with the responsibility to protect American lives and property were guilty of inexcusable negligence. American people are entitled to know the facts. Were inexperienced and untrained soldiers ordered by their officers, or permitted, to handle and load highly sensitive bombs?

Granting that the inspector general with a small group is making an inquiry into this disaster, their finding, even if it is made public, obviously would not and should not satisfy the American people that an investigation by fellow Air Force officers was thoroughly objective.

In my judgment, Mr. President, we in the Senate have an obligation to the American people to insist that a most thorough and searching investigation be made. A special committee of the Senate Committee on Armed Services should it seems to me, make an on-the-spot investigation. Yesterday I submitted a Senate resolution which would specifically authorize the Committee on Armed Services or a special subcommittee of that committee to investigate this disaster and report the facts. Not one scintilla of evidence should be overlooked. This is far too serious for American people to be satisfied with an investigation conducted by one group of officers investigating the acts or failure to act on the part of the commissioned officers of our Armed Forces. It is evident that there was inept handling of bombs and that some of the personnel, whether the commanding general or some subordinates or some civilian employees, were guilty of extreme inattention and negligence.

Not only were jet bombers which cost our taxpayers \$1,200,000 destroyed, but American lives were needlessly lost and the offensive might of our Armed Forces

May 20, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A2519

abilities over the whole field of transportation.

A frequent criticism in the past has been that the Federal Government has too many separate agencies dealing with transportation—the Maritime Administration, the ICC, the CAB, etc.—and that it has woefully lacked a coherent overall policy. In his new post, Mr. Boyd will be in a position to enunciate a general policy on transportation and perhaps to bring more order into this badly segmented field of Federal regulation.

Charles S. Murphy, Under Secretary of Agriculture, has been named to replace Mr. Boyd as Chairman of the CAB. The present five-member Board often has been divided 3 to 2 on recent decisions affecting route allocations and air fares. The change in personnel could mean a change in coming CAB decisions—including the long-debated future of Northeast Airlines.

Najeeb E. Halaby, who is stepping down as Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, has long been the most vigorous advocate in the administration for developing the supersonic transport (SST). His vigorous advocacy has helped to keep the proposal alive despite the doubts expressed in other administration and aviation circles.

Gen. William F. McKee, former Vice Chief of the Air Force, has been named to replace Mr. Halaby. General McKee is an experienced administrator and an authority on logistics. His position on the SST proposal hasn't been disclosed.

The latest appointments by the President conform to the generally high standards he has maintained in earlier appointments. All of these appointees, whatever their personal views on particular matters, are eminently qualified by background and experience to assume the positions to which they have been named.

The Delta Story: Saga of an Airline That Changed the Entire Economy of the South and of the Man Whose Vision Built It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1965

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to acknowledge the tremendous contribution that has been made to the economic progress and development of my area by Delta Airlines and its president and founder, Mr. C. E. Woolman.

What began as a one machine crop-dusting operation in the twenties has now become the fifth largest airline in the Nation, linking the burgeoning South to the industrial East and Midwest and strengthening the bonds of interest among our regions from coast to coast and into the Caribbean.

It has been said that "Delta Airlines is Woolman, and Woolman is Delta Airlines." Indeed, it is impossible to contemplate one without thinking of the other, for they are inseparable, and it is generally conceded that Mr. Woolman is probably without a peer among airline executives.

In all of this, Mr. Woolman still projects a personality of grace, charm, and humility. He takes a deep personal in-

terest in the people who work for Delta, and I am convinced that no company executive ever enjoyed greater or more universal affection, respect, and loyalty from his employees. Certainly the outstanding example of the life and career of this remarkable man should serve to inspire American youth to finer and greater accomplishments.

Mr. Speaker, the National Aeronautics magazine, the publication of the National Pilots Association, pays an extraordinary tribute to Mr. Woolman and Delta Airlines in its June issue. In order to share this significant account of example and growth with others, I include the text of this article as part of my remarks:

THE DELTA STORY: THE SAGA OF AN AIRLINE THAT CHANGED THE ENTIRE ECONOMY OF THE SOUTH AND OF THE MAN WHOSE VISION BUILT IT

The guiding hand of Delta Air Lines is that of Collett Everman Woolman, modest, hard-working president and general manager, whose personality has quietly dominated this friendly, progressive airline since its beginning as the world's first commercial crop-dusting outfit back in 1924 and 1925.

While a student at the University of Illinois, Woolman attended the world's first aviation meet at Rheims, France, in 1910, and following World War I he learned to fly in a Curtis OX-5 "Jenny." But aviation offered few opportunities in those early years, and he had to be content to enter another field upon completion of his schooling. It was a fortunate field, however, with the extension department of Louisiana State University, and it soon led him right back into aviation.

Throughout the South and the length and breadth of the fertile Mississippi delta, which was to inspire the name of a great airline, cotton production was being seriously reduced by the boll weevil. Based on the experimental work by Dr. B. R. Coad at the Tallulah Cotton Experimental Station, Woolman and several associates became interested in the problem in 1925 and organized Huff Daland Dusters, the world's first airplane dusting organization. The advanced techniques which they developed proved amazingly potent in the battle against cotton's hungry enemies. Cotton growers began to sit up and take notice. Quickly the company's operations expanded across the southern United States into Mexico and South America. With its 18 airplanes, Huff Daland Dusters was the largest unsubsidized air fleet in the world at that time.

In 1927 the company in stiff competition from wealthy German firms secured air mail rights in Peru. And C. E. Woolman became the first American operator south of the equator in the western hemisphere.

"The South American operation was getting pretty big by the following year, when we found ourselves right in the middle of a red hot local revolution," Woolman recalls. "Both sides tried to get hold of our airplanes for their armies. We sold our dusters to a local company, and our airmail routes to Pan American Grace. The route became the nucleus of what is now the Panagra system."

But the company's dusting operations never stopped in the South. Taking the name of Delta Air Service in 1928, the company continued its operations in the agricultural field—and its agricultural division is still operating successfully today, under the direction of Dr. Coad, who joined the company in 1931.

But bigger undertakings were afoot. Dreams of expansion led to the purchase of three six-passenger, 90-mile-per-hour Travel Airs, powered by 300-horsepower Wright "Whirlwinds." On June 1, 1929, Delta Air Service inaugurated its first scheduled passenger flight between Dallas and Jackson,

Miss., with stops at Shreveport and Monroe, La. As new planes arrived from the factory, service was extended to Birmingham, Ala., and then to Atlanta, Ga.

Delta was squeezed out in the political maneuvers of 1930 when the Post Office Department awarded the airmail contract for the southern route to a rival airline, but Woolman retained faith. In 1934, in new bids, the company, now known as Delta Air Corp., won an airmail contract for a route from Dallas to Atlanta and Charleston, S.C. Trimotored Stinsons were used, which could carry another passenger and fly 10 miles an hour faster than the Travel Airs.

Delta flew its first airmail across Dixie on July 4, 1934. The following year, night flights were inaugurated between Atlanta and Fort Worth, the most heavily traveled Delta route. In 1941, the Civil Aeronautics Board awarded the rising company two new routes—from Atlanta to Cincinnati and from Atlanta to Savannah. That same year headquarters were moved from Monroe, La., where Huff-Daland Dusters was born, to Atlanta.

During the early years of World War II, Delta relinquished half of its planes and pilots to the Air Force and mobilized for other assignments to help the war effort. The company flew military cargo between various military installations, modified aircraft for special purposes, overhauled engines and instruments, and trained hundreds of Air Force pilots and mechanics.

With the war warming up to its hottest peak, the organization could still expand. In 1943 the CAB authorized a new route between Fort Worth and New Orleans, and Delta moved another step toward becoming the "Air Line of the South."

Closely following the atomic bomb and Japan's surrender, came the news of Delta's largest route award to that date—the 1,022-mile Chicago-Miami and Chicago-Charleston, S.C., routes.

On December 18, 1945, the company's name was changed to Delta Air Lines, Inc., and Woolman moved up from vice president and general manager to president and general manager.

The airline expanded rapidly, including a merger in 1953 with Chicago and Southern Air Lines, which had been organized in 1933 on the west coast but shifted operations to the Mississippi Valley in 1934. The merger added 5,854 miles and six Caribbean cities to Delta's route.

In November 1955, the Civil Aeronautics Board awarded Delta 1,075 miles of new routes into "Main Street America," and on February 1, 1956, the airline inaugurated service between Dixie and the New York-Washington area.

Delta advanced into the ranks of the transcontinental air carriers in 1961 when the CAB awarded it the Southern Transcontinental Route from Dallas-Fort Worth to Los Angeles and San Francisco.

Today Delta serves 60 cities. Its 14,119-mile route system serves the centers of government and finance in the East, the industrial areas of the Midwest, the dynamic South and Southwest, the growing west coast, and the vacation playgrounds in Florida and the Caribbean, with headquarters at its main focal point of Atlanta, Ga.

First in the world to inaugurate DC-8 and Convair 880 jetliner service, Delta has a total jet fleet investment in excess of \$140 million. The airline has 16 Convair 880's and by the end of 1965 will have 20 DC-8's (including 3 scheduled for delivery in 1966).

Delta received its first DC-8 jet airliner on July 22, 1959, and service was inaugurated on September 18, 1959. Convair 880 service was inaugurated on May 15, 1960.

In April 1963, Delta became the first airline in the world to place orders for the Douglas-built DC-9 twin jet when it announced purchase of 15 short-haul DC-9's at a total cost

A2520

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

May 20, 1965

in excess of \$50 million, including spare parts. Deliveries will begin in early 1966.

In May 1964, Delta and Pan American World Airways inaugurated the first single-place service between New Orleans, Atlanta, and Europe.

All cities on the Delta system will benefit from a new computer-based electronic reservations system which Delta is programming into use, with systemwide completion scheduled this year. The IBM Deltamatic system links Delta's cities to a powerful computer center in Atlanta, and up-to-the-second flight and passenger information is available to reservations agents in a matter of seconds.

Over the years Delta has prided itself on the quality of its service. Passengers have come to expect extra special treatment on Delta, and the airline's continued, steady growth indicates that they aren't being disappointed.

A Great Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. OLIVA HUOT

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. HUOT. Mr. Speaker, on November 22 of last year, Miss Patricia Letourneau, Brookline Avenue, Dover, N.H., composed a poem saluting our late and beloved President John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

Patricia is 13 years of age and I am honored to place her fine composition in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and before the Members of Congress.

It is my intention, Mr. Speaker, to offer this poem to the Kennedy Memorial Library in Boston, Mass., after it is inserted in the RECORD.

A GREAT MAN

(By Miss Patricia Letourneau, Dover, N.H., Nov. 22, 1964)

Four years ago on Thanksgiving Day,
The Kennedy family sat down to pray.
The only thing unusual about this, you see,
Was that John Kennedy has just won the presidency.

And as he slowly said the Grace,
A wonderful expression went over his face.
His eyes lit up, and then he smiled,
And looked to one side at his wife and child.

For, inside his heart he was wondering,
If he could answer all the needs his new job would bring.

To run a country, and be a good father too,
That's a very difficult task to do.

But in his heart he knew he could,
Do all the things for which the Presidency stood.

And then he looked to his side once more,
And found the encouragement he was looking for.

For, his wife, Jacqueline, looked into his eyes,
And suddenly he realized—
As long as he had her encouraging smile,
He could surpass any trial.

This was the scene, 4 years ago on Thanksgiving Day,
As the Kennedy family sat down to pray.

Three years later, on the same joyous day,
A whole new mood had shown its way.
An empty seat, a missing smile,
Were evident all the while.

The same people were there, the traditional food,

But, still no one was in the mood.

For, deep inside, their hearts were chilled,
Knowing his place would never again be filled.

People all over the world conveyed

The feeling they had felt on that bitter day.

We had lost a leader, a really great man,

And Lyndon Johnson had taken stand.

But they took no notice at all of this,

'Cause they noticed so much, all they now missed.

But Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy missed him most of all,

For now there was no answer to her loving call.

Words just cannot explain—

The agonizing misery, sorrow, and pain.

His children, of course, missed him, too,

The youngest one was only two.

How could you tell them—their father was dead,

Murdered by a man—shot in the head???

The worst 2 days in almost everyone's life,

The ones so filled with sorrow and strife,

Were the day of Mr. Kennedy's death,

And the day they laid him down to rest.

The youngest man in history,

Ever to conquer the Presidency.

A very great man at forty-three,

And yet—he was killed deliberately.

A man with love and honesty,

Moral strength and stability,

I salute—John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

Gardner Jackson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, Gardner Jackson will be sorely missed by his friends in the House and in the Senate. The kind of lobbying he did, for the poor and mistreated in our society, made a day when he came to call, a better day. In his kindly and selfless concern, his willingness to stick with the fight when it looked hopeless, he inspired others to keep going. There have been many letters and editorials written about this singular man, but I would like the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to reprint a letter to the editor of the May 18 Washington Post written by Ludwig Hamburger. He expresses far better than I could how so many of us feel about the loss of "Pat" Jackson:

GARDNER JACKSON

May I request the hospitality of your columns for a footnote on Gardner Jackson? You and others have rightly commemorated his incessant action in fighting for justice, in helping the submerged, and in combating the indignities of the world; and you have rightly praised him for the extraordinary exuberance he brought to all he did, for his sense of ardor and passionate conviction, adorned as they were by modesty, spiced by humor, and devoid of malice.

But there was yet more to the man. Above all Gardner Jackson was selfless. He had no ax to grind and no nest egg to hatch; he never asked for dividends, returns, or credit; his one and only commitment was to the

causes he fought and to the people he helped. He, for one, followed—long before it was made—President Kennedy's celebrated call: Ask not what your country can do for you; ask what you can do for your country. And any reward he may have expected (and he received none other) was the consciousness of having been true to that precept.

This was the secret of the impact he made, he, a one-man lobby, who "represented" exactly no one. This won him the confidence, nay, the love of those who associated with him. This opened before him the doors of the high and mighty right up to the White House. This accounted for his extraordinary effectiveness in getting things done that seemed hopelessly tied up in redtape or held up by unawareness or ill will.

Gardner Jackson was, in the finest American and Christian tradition, a rugged individualist who served his fellow man. Speaking, I have no doubt, for hundreds of Washingtonians in all walks of life, indeed for all those who were so fortunate as to cross the path of that unique personality, I wish to suggest that we name a school for Gardner Jackson to preserve his memory and to hold up his example to the young.

LUDWIG HAMBURGER.

WASHINGTON.

Viet Talks on Our Terms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I once heard President Johnson express an idea about foreign policy this way:

Our guard is always up—but our hand is always out.

Today in the Vietnamese conflict we can see this admirable principle at work. Our guard is up; we have committed men, money, arms, and the unbending determination of our Government to arresting the advance of communism in Asia.

Yet the hand of peace and fraternal cooperation is extended—even to our adversaries in the Vietnamese struggle. We have called for unconditional talks—and for a vast program of peaceful, constructive development in Vietnam rather than destruction and waste.

I am one of those who believe deeply in the wisdom and necessity of the President's policy, and I commend to my colleagues an excellent editorial on the subject from the Johnstown, Pa., Tribune-Democrat:

[From the Johnstown (Pa.) Tribune-Democrat, Apr. 28, 1965]

VIET TALKS ON OUR TERMS

Ridiculous pleas for an end to U.S. bombing raids against North Vietnam continue to be issued, and, unfortunately, there is slim chance that the pleas will cease.

The issuers of these requests feel that if we stop attacking supply depots in the north, the path to the negotiating table will be shortened. Obviously, they aren't thinking too clearly—or they have a warped faith in the integrity of the aggressors in the southeast Asia conflict.

It is difficult, at best, to understand how those who want the bombing to be stopped

May 20, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPEN

can even think that this is the key to negotiations. Should the bombings be ended, the North Vietnamese will take swift advantage of the situation to increase encouragement and supplies to the Communist Vietcong in the south. Even now, North Vietnam is sending some of its regular army units into the battle, according to Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara.

Surely these pleaders don't think that South Vietnam is the only target of the Communists in Asia. As with all Communists, the southeast Asia Reds envision conquest of all nations struggling to maintain freedom. And should the United States enter into negotiations on the terms of the Communists, it will be just opening the door to further attempts to expand the Red influence.

In answer to the pleadings of those seeking a letup in American action in Vietnam, the American Conservative Union has drawn up a list of proposals. Among other specifics, the union calls for an immediate sealing off of South Vietnam's borders by stopping guerrilla operations and forcing the end of unprovoked Communist aggression. The union also states that the United States must win in Vietnam because it is "not an isolated engagement but is the key to Communist expansion in Asia. Loss of the war in Vietnam, militarily or by 'negotiation,' therefore means resumption of hostilities on other fronts on a greater scale at greater disadvantages."

Now that is the type of thinking we agree with. The United States and South Vietnam must win the war. They must bring the aggressors to overwhelming defeat and must make them ask for negotiation—on our terms. Any stoppage of U.S. military efforts short of clear victory will make peace talks more difficult than negotiations with Communist governments usually are.

President Johnson has made a sound decision in continuing attacks on supply depots in the north. And he must remain firm in fighting the war or the result of our efforts to date will be lost.

The bombing raids against the Hanoi government of the north are serving a double purpose. In addition to hindering transfer of supplies to the Vietcong, they are demonstrating to Red China that there is to be no sanctuary for aggressors—no sanctuary such as the Red Chinese enjoyed during their involvement in the Korean war. And certainly now, when the Chinese are making "full preparations" to send their own people "to fight together with the Vietnamese people and drive out U.S. aggressors" is no time to stop taking the fight to the north.

The time for the United States to stop bombing the north is when it is clearly apparent that the north itself has stopped sending men and materiel into the south. It is up to the north to stop being an aggressor. Then—and only then—should the United States agree to sit at a negotiation table.

Let Them Rot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1965

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz has been doing an outstanding job in trying to improve the programs of recruitment in the area of migrant farm labor. His efforts in this respect have been accomplished by

significant progress in achieving a decent wage for migrant farm labor tasks.

The response to these dedicated, enlightened efforts of Secretary Wirtz have too often been scorn and critical abuse. That such criticism is unwarranted is now being borne out by actually experience in California where farm employers find the supply of domestic labor ample where fair wages and working conditions prevail.

For this reason, I place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the May 14, 1965, issue of the Criterion, the weekly newspaper of the Catholic Archdiocese of Indianapolis. The editorial contains an intelligent, responsible tribute to the courage and wisdom of Secretary Wirtz in the handling of the migrant farm labor controversy.

The editorial follows:

LET THEM ROT

One of the many subdramas of these superdramatic times has W. Willard Wirtz, U.S. Secretary of Labor, as hero (or villain) and the corporate farming industry as villain (or hero).

We'll take the unparenthesized version.

Wirtz is gambling his Cabinet post on the Johnson administration backing him up on his decision that corporate agriculture should obtain its seasonal workers through the domestic labor market and pay wages that compete with those in other fields.

Those who have enriched themselves on the heartless exploitation of itinerant farmhands have declared war on Wirtz. They have the support of powerful politicians who feel obligated to keep influential constituents happy.

On March 28 Wirtz announced flatly that the 1964 act of Congress ending the importation of Mexican migrants would stand.

Last week California strawberry growers struck back. They said they would let their berries rot unless pickers were made available.

Father John Doran in his syndicated column in last Friday's Criterion said that none of California's unemployed was willing to do the work required.

On Saturday, however, United Press International reported that more pickers had lined up for work than the strawberry growers could accommodate.

This put a large dent in the fiction that unemployed Americans will not do "stoop labor." They are eager to do it for decent pay and working conditions. They are not willing to do it, however, under the scandalous "Grapes of Wrath" conditions which suit too much of the corporate farming industry.

We do not expect the "strawberry crisis" to be the last such effort to perpetuate the immoral, antisocial slaves-for-rent system. There likely will be new crises in Indiana, Michigan, and elsewhere as crops ripen. There will be threats to let the tomatoes, cherries, apples, and other produce rot. Washington's reply to those threats will be, we hope, "Go ahead and let them rot."

Growers are unlikely to carry out such threats on a large scale. But, if they were to, the country well could survive such shortages in order to put an end to a labor-supply system which nourishes the harshest and most bitter poverty in America.

And growers who refused to put their own houses in order would, in a short time, be replaced by other growers who could make a profit and still live up to improved labor standards.

Meanwhile, the country owes Secretary Wirtz a debt of thanks for making an uncompromising stand against worker exploitation of the worst sort.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

May 20, 1965

to emphasize the point, however, that this law would apply only to those manufacturers and owners whose products are in free and open competition with close substitutes produced by other competing manufacturers.

Before going into a more detailed discussion of the principal provisions of the proposed Quality Stabilization Act, I would like to digress for a moment and recall for you some of the actions which have been taken on a National and State level to legislate against certain harmful competitive practices.

I am sure that many of you will remember that price cutting or sales below cost at the retail level became a serious impediment to the competitive process during the depression of the early 1930's, resulting in the elimination of hundreds of independent retailers. To counter this alarming and dangerous trend, several States during this period adopted fair trade laws which were designed to exempt manufacturers of name-brand commodities from State antitrust laws, thereby allowing them the option to set minimum resale prices on their products shipped in intrastate commerce.

The first of these laws was enacted in California in 1931. In short, it exempted from the State's antitrust laws any contract wherein the seller of a brand-name commodity, which is in free and open competition with close substitutes, bound the buyer, who was reselling it, to charge the price specified by the seller. Initially this law proved ineffective, especially since retailers not signing such an agreement continued to undercut the prices of those retailers who signed resale price maintenance contracts with suppliers. Consequently, an amendment to the law was adopted in 1933 which incorporated a measure termed the nonsigner clause. Such a proviso made contracts maintaining resale prices of name-brand products binding on those retailers who refused to sign such contracts, providing at least one retailer in the State had signed such a contract.

Subsequent to this action taken by California, many other States took steps to adopt fair trade laws which, in most instances, were close copies of the California statute. Shortly thereafter, in 1936, the U.S. Supreme Court upheld these State fair trade laws in the case, *Old Dearborn Distribution Company v. Seagram Distillers Corporation* (229 U.S. 183).

Shortly after this important Supreme Court decision, resale price maintenance or fair trade became widespread throughout the Nation. And by 1941, all of the States except Missouri, Texas, Vermont, and the District of Columbia had enacted fair trade laws.

The passage of the Miller-Tydings Act by Congress in 1937 also played a major role in encouraging States to adopt fair trade laws. Prior to the enactment of this act, parties to resale maintenance contracts applied only to intrastate transactions between the supplier and retailer. If, for example, a contract were made between the retailer in one State and a manufacturer in another, such an agreement was automatically in violation of Federal antitrust laws. Thus,

since the great bulk of brand name products traveled in interstate commerce, it proved difficult if not impossible to maintain price schedules under existing Federal laws. For this reason, the Miller-Tydings amendment to the Sherman Antitrust Act was passed, legalizing interstate resale price maintenance contracts between producers and retailers of branded goods. This exemption from the Federal antitrust laws applied, however, only to those States having fair trade laws. Price fixing agreements between retailers and producers in States not having such laws were still in violation of Federal antitrust laws.

Up until 1950, 45 States had fair trade laws. However, in 1951 the fair trade movement was dealt a severe blow by a U.S. Supreme Court decision in *Schwegmann Brothers v. Calvert Distillers Corporation* (314 U.S. 384). This opinion held that retailers not signing resale price maintenance contracts could not be forced to abide by such contracts exempted from Federal antitrust laws under the Miller-Tydings Act. This meant, therefore, that the nonsigner provision of resale price maintenance contracts could apply only to those contracts involving strictly intrastate commerce. This obviously greatly reduced the effectiveness of State fair trade laws which applied to both inter- and intrastate transactions covered by resale price maintenance contracts. As a result, price wars became widespread throughout the Nation. And this in turn brought demands for Congress to enact legislation to counteract the effect of the Supreme Court decision. As a result, Congress in 1952 passed the McGuire Act.

This act reversed the Schwegmann decision by making resale price maintenance on branded products, which are in free and open competition with one another, binding to nonsigners in those States having fair trade laws, thereby making interstate transactions covered by resale price maintenance contracts subject to State fair trade laws.

Despite the enactment of this law, 24 States since the early 1950's have had their fair trade laws declared either partially or completely invalid by State courts. Thus, in effect, those States having their fair trade laws declared partially invalid had stricken from their laws the all important nonsigner clause. Such actions by the State courts in these States have, therefore, rendered fair trade laws more or less ineffective, since the nonsigner clause was the key provision in these laws.

To counter these developments the proponents of fair trade quickly came to the conclusion that Congress must enact a Federal fair trade law which would legalize resale price maintenance at the retail level by manufacturers who produce commodities sold in interstate commerce and which are in free and open competition with articles in the same general class. Moreover, such a law would eliminate the problem of the nonsigner provision in State laws since the producer of a brand name commodity would be allowed to stipulate a price without entering into an agreement with at least one retailer in each State in

May 20, 1965

of thought. It is understood that the major veterans organizations are not in accord with the compromise and feel that even if one hospital is closed, that constitutes a distinct loss to the veteran population of this Nation.

Many Members of Congress who have stubbornly opposed the VA decision are apparently in a mood to continue their opposition. This congressional sentiment furthermore does not stem solely from those Congressmen whose districts feel the impact of the order. Many Congressmen express themselves as feeling that the VA directive is only the preliminary step in doing away with rights and benefits that have been granted to veterans and their dependents over a period of years. Indications are that their opposition to any compromise will continue.

Representatives of veteran groups apparently take the position that a battle has been won but the ultimate winning of the war has not yet been completed.

We feel that the order to close the VA installations is a direct encroachment upon the rights and privileges of the Nation's veterans. They have been promised the best medical care available. There is serious doubt that such care can be provided, under announced VA plans, particularly for those ill and needy veterans who happen to reside in rural areas.

Let the fight go on for complete revocation of the VA directive of January 13.

More on Jet Noise: NASA Conference on Aircraft Operating Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks I have addressed the House in a series of statements on the subject of aircraft noise abatement, in which I have sought to alert my colleagues to both the urgency and the national scope of the problem. On May 6, 1965, I introduced H.R. 7981 a bill to amend section 203(a) on the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 to provide for a program of research and development by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to reduce or eliminate aircraft noise, and for other purposes. On May 6, 1965 I also introduced H.R. 7982, a bill to amend section 302 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for the elimination of aircraft noise, and for other purposes. Both bills have been referred to committee.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 13, 1965, under "Extension of Remarks," I informed my colleagues that the floodgates of litigation due to jet noise were now open and I included a summary of aircraft noise litigation pending in 18 States represented by 269 Members of the House of Representatives. The purpose of this summary was to call attention to the national scope of the problem and to interest my colleagues in the proposed legislation.

Mr. Speaker, on May 10, 11, and 12, 1965, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration conducted a conference on aircraft operating problems at Langley Research Center, Hampton, Va. More than 400 technical experts from industry and government attended the

conference and 34 papers were presented by scientists from Ames Research Center, Moffett Field, Calif.; Flight Research Center, Edwards, Calif.; Langley; and the Federal Aviation Agency.

I was privileged to attend a number of sessions of the conference on May 10, 1965, because of my interest in the jet noise problem. I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the highlights of some papers relating to jet noise presented at the conference. The reduction of aircraft noise will come about only from a coordinated research program framed by the Federal Government and from transmission of technical findings to all Government departments and to the airframe and air transport industries.

Conferences such as the Langley conference serve to expedite this process of transmitting research findings into practical operational techniques and use. The following excerpts from NASA's Report on Aircraft Improvements—NASA Release No. 65-160—are of importance to those engaged in the field of aircraft noise control:

"Factors Relating to Airport-Community Noise Problem," by Harvey H. Hubbard, Jimmy M. Cawthorn, and W. Latham Copeland of Langley, dealt with aircraft noise, factors relating to the noise level imposed on the community by aircraft operations, and with community reaction. Since human sensitivity is the basic factor in the noise problem, considerable attention has been directed to subjective reaction studies.

Two noise properties found to increase the annoyance potential of a given physical noise level are the presence of pure tones, such as jet engine compressor whine, and increased duration of the noise. Reduction of the noise at its source is another area of investigation.

Among the means cited for achieving major reductions in source noise were increasing the by-pass ratios of turbo-fan engines to substantially greater values than presently used, and suppressing compressor whine by such devices as inlet resonators, suitable spacing of compressor stators and rotors, and checking the inlet air flow. Studies of compatible land use is planned as future work. It was noted also that adoption of different operating procedures for aircraft might provide some alleviation of the community noise problem.

"Preliminary Measurements of Takeoff and Landing Noise From a New Instrumented Range," by Carole S. Tanner and Norman J. McLeod of the NASA Flight Research Center, described a new aircraft noise-research range at Edwards, Calif., which is expected to provide an accurate range for future studies of noise problems with operational aircraft.

The new facility consists of an array of 12 microphones installed at intervals along both sides of the runway and beyond the runway for a total distance of 25,000 feet and connected by cables to a van fitted with specially developed equipment for accurately measuring and analyzing the noise levels at each microphone station. Preliminary measurements in takeoffs of the XB-70 airplane and a jet transport have pointed up some apparent inadequacies in noise prediction procedures which this new facility should ultimately help to resolve.

"Preliminary Study of Steep Instrument Approach of Three Conventional Aircraft," by Albert W. Hall, Robert A. Champine, and Donald J. McGinley, Jr., of Langley, summarized an investigation aimed at defining the steepest instrument landing approach paths that might be operationally practicable in the interest of reducing airspace involvement in landing operations and the noise inflicted on an airport's neighbors.

Very limited tests with three airplanes flown by research pilots ranging from a trainer to a large jet transport indicated that a reasonable upper limit for instrument approaches was about 6° angle of glide slope for all three planes, as compared to the 3° presently used in instrument landing systems. Although the guidance equipment used for the tests was capable of guiding the airplane all the way to touchdown, the workload imposed on the pilot in precisely controlling the path of the airplane in two directions, with the limited information display provided, was too great to permit reliable all the way, or zero-zero landings. When his workload was reduced, by the copilot taking over lateral-directional control, the pilot was able, in some cases, to complete his landing on instruments.

Mr. Speaker, I also call the attention of my colleagues to an article appearing today in the Wall Street Journal—first page, offering the hope that "New Design May Ease Supersonic Airliners' Sonic Boom Problem" in which NASA engineers say, "Fuselage Change Reduces Noise Level"; the article by Mr. Richard P. Cooke, staff reporter, refers to the Government engineers who addressed the NASA Conference at Langley Field to which I have already alluded and at which I was privileged to be present.

The Wall Street Journal article follows:

NEW DESIGN MAY EASE SUPERSONIC AIRLINERS' SONIC BOOM PROBLEM—NASA ENGINEERS SAY FUSELAGE CHANGE REDUCES NOISE LEVEL—LOCKHEED, BOEING INTERESTED

(By Richard P. Cooke)

HAMPTON, Va.—Two Government engineers here think they have hit on a way to overcome a major hitch—the sonic boom—in developing a 2,000-mile-per-hour airliner.

The loudest boom occurs when an airplane breaks the sonic barrier, which is about 660 miles an hour at an altitude of 40,000 feet. But a continuous series of lesser booms reverberates through the sky as a plane cruises at supersonic speeds. On the ground the effect of the booms can be shattering to both human nerves and the windows of buildings. Some aerospace researchers have been fearful that the boom problem might seriously restrict the operation of the supersonic transport, commonly known as the SST.

The Government engineers—Harry Carlson and Francis E. McLean, of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, believe the problem can be solved by a change in the proposed design for the fuselage of the SST. Working with a 4-inch stainless steel model in a wind tunnel at NASA's Langley Research Center, the engineers found that by flattening the fuselage just forward of the wing, they could alter the airflow in such a way as to cut the boom to an acceptable level. Much testing remains to be done, and definite conclusions can't be reached until the theory is tried on a full-sized jet. But the proposed design change is generating widespread interest in the aerospace field, including the engineering departments of Lockheed Aircraft Corp. and Boeing Co., both seeking a Federal contract to build a supersonic airliner.

THE FAA SETS A LIMIT

A sonic boom results from the sudden increase in atmospheric pressure produced in the path of an airplane traveling faster than sound. The level of a boom is measured in terms of the added pounds of pressure per square foot produced by the plane. If an SST, as originally designed, crashed through the sonic barrier at 35,000 to 40,000 feet, the excess pressure would reach more than 2 pounds per square foot, according to present estimates. But the Federal Aviation Agency, which has conducted extensive tests of the effects of sonic booms on people and struc-

A2534

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

May 20, 1965

tures in Oklahoma City, has prescribed 1.5 pounds as the maximum increase in atmospheric pressure that the American SST can produce.

The NASA engineers say wind tunnel tests show their SST design would produce a pressure increase of 1.3 pounds, which would mean the resulting boom would be well within the limits of tolerability established by the FAA. While the new design would not achieve a comparable reduction in pressure when cruising at 1,600 to 2,000 miles an hour at 70,000 feet or more, it would still keep the cruising boom within acceptable levels.

Patterning the SST fuselage forward of the wing might well bring other benefits besides diminished sonic booms. NASA engineers Carlson and McLean say it would help the lift and might permit room for more seats. Present SST designs provide for 200 to 250 seats.

SAVING MONEY FOR AIRLINES

Airline men add that if the NASA design theory proves correct, it might mean important operating economies. The most efficient way for a supersonic jet to fly is to break the sonic barrier and achieve cruising altitude as quickly as possible. But as originally conceived the SST would have to climb to 50,000 feet or more before going supersonic in order to reduce the effect of the sonic boom on the ground.

But if the NASA design works as expected and reduces the severity of the boom created by breaking the sound barrier, this uneconomical flight plan would no longer have to be followed. Soon after takeoff, the plane could be gunned to cruising speed and altitude.

Lockheed's vice president in charge of SST development, Robert Bailey, says the NASA experiments have already prompted Lockheed to begin testing the new design theory on its own. So far, says Mr. Bailey, flight tests of an F-104 jet fighter have confirmed the theory.

NASA's fat fuselage theory is not the only hopeful development in sonic boom research. Some investigators are also coming to the conclusion that the huge supersonic airliners (the American SST will be up to 260 feet long, compared with 55 feet for the F-104 Lockheed is using in its test) may pose less of a sonic boom problem than smaller jets.

Engineers explain the phenomenon in this fashion: As a supersonic plane moves through the air, the nose and wings first create a sharp rise in air pressure. Then, as the air moves farther back along the fuselage, pressure drops below normal. Finally, it rebounds to normal. The initial rise in pressure and the final rebound to a normal level both produce sonic booms. With a small plane these booms occur so close together that they sound like one extremely loud noise. It's believed that with a giant SST, however, the length of the plane will result in two relatively muted booms rather than a single intense boom.

Mr. Speaker, I welcome and invite the comments of my colleagues on this and my other statements in the RECORD, as well as on H.R. 7981 and H.R. 7982.

The Danger of Miscalculation in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable that the recent pause in our bombing of military and strategic installations in North Vietnam did not pro-

duce more tangible results. High hopes may too often hang on fragile threads, but it was a hopeful entree which could have been expanded if the Communists had been willing.

If the pause failed in its major purpose, however, it did serve several other important functions.

It made clear to all who care to listen that our abiding goal is peace and that we are willing to pursue many paths to achieve it.

It made clear, as James Reston pointed out in the New York Times on May 19, that we have no desire or intention to destroy North Vietnam, to change its social order or its political structure.

It made clear that the Vietnamese leaders, at this point at least, have no intention of lessening their aggressive pursuits; that they believe they will achieve their goal of dominating all Vietnam by force, and that they interpret our recess in bombing as a sign of weakness.

It also made clear that we want, that we are encouraging, the negotiations which are essential to any meaningful settlement, and as Mr. Reston further points out in his article of May 19:

This suggests concessions of free elections that previous U.S. Governments were not prepared to risk.

Mr. Speaker, the bombings, sadly, have been renewed. They were renewed because the leaders in Hanoi, urged on by Peiping, refused to accept or even consider our overtures for a peaceful solution.

We can only hope that President Johnson and his advisers will not despair; that they will continue, and even accelerate, the diplomatic offensive which is the essential corollary of our will to resist aggression.

Mr. Speaker, I include the thoughtful article by James Reston, to which I have referred, for our colleagues information: WASHINGTON: THE DANGER OF MISCALCULATION IN VIETNAM

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON.—The danger now in Vietnam is that the Communists will miscalculate the character and psychology of President Johnson.

The pro-Chinese elements, who are now reported to have the greatest influence over the North Vietnamese Government, have let the pause in the bombing go by without responding to President Johnson's public and private efforts to start negotiations. And they are apparently operating on the assumption that the strategy and tactics they used to defeat the French there in 1954 will succeed again against the United States.

It is a risky assumption. They may be able to bring the war to a critical battle on the ground, as their same general, Vo Nguyen Giap, did in the conquest of the French at Dienbienphu in 1954, but the balance and location of power are now quite different.

THE FALSE ANALOGIES

The American forces are not trapped in the encircling hills of a Dienbienphu. They are concentrated on the coast with easy access to the sea. Even if the American land airfields were knocked out, as the French airfields were neutralized at Dienbienphu, the United States has more power on its aircraft carriers off the coast than both sides could command in the decisive battle against the French 11 years ago.

The Communist hope of a quick and decisive victory during the period of the monsoon rains requires the destruction of the

American command, and nothing could be further removed from Lyndon Johnson's Texas frontier psychology than to tolerate such a disaster, no matter what weapons he had to employ to avoid it. This is the danger of any such Communist miscalculation.

It is conceivable that the United States could be invited out by the South Vietnamese, or negotiated out at an international conference, or even worn out in a protracted war, but to be thrown out is the one thing that is least likely under Johnson, and any attempt to throw him out of Vietnam would only unify the nation behind him.

JOHNSON'S INITIATIVES

He believes he has now tried to meet every honorable proposal for a negotiated accommodation, and every military restraint short of nonresistance or ineffective resistance.

He tried to hold the line with a few thousand noncombatant "advisers." It didn't work. He let the advisers fire when they were fired on. He tried limited retaliatory force for attacks on American ships in the Gulf of Tonkin, then retaliation for attacks only on American bases on land, and then retaliatory attacks for Vietcong raids on the South Vietnamese.

He tried not going beyond the 17th parallel into North Vietnam. Then he tried going north, first to hit military targets and then subsidiary transportation targets; and at the private urging of the Russians, the British, the Japanese, and influential citizens at home, he stopped the bombing temporarily and at the same time urged negotiations both publicly and privately, through the Canadians.

The lack of any positive response from Hanoi does not mean that Washington will now order any dramatic increase in the severity of the bombing, and it will go on for a time, and there will then probably be another pause and another call for negotiations.

Meanwhile, the North Vietnamese apparently believe they are still winning and will probably have to go at the U.S. forces on the ground, and this is their dilemma. For every success they have on the ground will cost them at least double in retaliatory strikes from the air until they agree to talk.

This is the policy of the U.S. Government, so far as it can be ascertained. It does not aim at the destruction of North Vietnam or at any change in the social or political structure of the North Vietnamese regime.

SELF-DETERMINATION

It implies the right of self-determination for the South Vietnamese, even the right to create a coalition government with the Communists if they so desire, though Washington certainly does not desire this.

In the view of this Government, this suggests concessions of free election that previous U.S. Governments were not prepared to risk, but the silence of Hanoi and the savage opposition of Peiping to any talks have only convinced the Johnson administration that these offers plus the pause in the bombing were merely interpreted in Hanoi as signs of weakness in Washington.

Accordingly, the bombing has started again, and the battle will probably get worse before the President decides on another pause and another opportunity to talk about peace.

The Loaded Teach-Ins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1965

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago there was deep concern in this